United Nations A/71/1006

General Assembly

Distr.: General
2 August 2017

Original: English

Seventy-first session
Agenda item 20
Implementation of the outcomes of the United Nations Conferences on Human Settlements and on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)

Report of the High-level Independent Panel to Assess and Enhance the Effectiveness of UN-Habitat

Note by the Secretary-General

In paragraphs 172 and 173 of the annex to resolution 71/256, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit to it during its seventy-first session an evidence-based and independent assessment of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), with recommendations to enhance its effectiveness, efficiency, accountability and oversight in its normative and operational mandates, its governance structure, its partnerships and its financial capability.

Pursuant to that request, the Secretary-General has the honour to transmit to the General Assembly the report of the High-level Independent Panel to Assess and Enhance the Effectiveness of UN-Habitat.

17-13252 (E) 250817

Please recycle

Report of the High-level Independent Panel to Assess and Enhance the Effectiveness of UN-Habitat

Summary

The present report, in recognition of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the New Urban Agenda and the transformative changes they imply for global development, peace and security, focuses on the critical need for action on pressing issues related to sustainable urbanization and the assessment of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) as a fit-for-purpose organization to deliver on these bold objectives.

The Panel responsible for the report was mandated by the General Assembly in paragraphs 172 and 173 of the annex to resolution 71/256 to undertake an independent, objective, evidence-based review and assessment of UN-Habitat with recommendations to enhance its effectiveness, efficiency, accountability and oversight in its normative and operational mandates, its governance structure, its partnerships and its financial capability. The Panel was encouraged by the Secretary-General to make bold and ambitious recommendations, considering the challenges and opportunities posed by urbanization, the impact of those challenges and opportunities on global development, peace and security and the importance of leaving no one behind.

The Panel acknowledges here the challenges that both UN-Habitat and the wider United Nations system face, challenges which have compromised the ability to respond nimbly and effectively to rapid global change. It draws attention in particular to the failure within the United Nations system to adequately acknowledge the pace, scale and implications of urbanization, the dependence of the 2030 Agenda on the direction of urban development, or the fundamental role played in urban development by local governments and other local actors.

The Panel agrees that UN-Habitat has limitations in terms of accountability, transparency and efficiency, that its resources have been inadequate, insecure and unpredictable, and that the need to chase funds has caused it to stray from its normative mandate. In the Panel's assessment, the first priority is to save, stabilize and then rapidly strengthen UN-Habitat to equip it for a renewed role based on the 2030 Agenda and the New Urban Agenda. To support the efforts of UN-Habitat, the Panel recommends the establishment of an independent coordinating mechanism that will bring together all United Nations organizations and partners on the topic of urban sustainability, to be known as UN-Urban.

In response to the challenges, the Panel recommends for UN-Habitat a renewed commitment to its normative mission, with an emphasis on the 2030 Agenda inspired commitment to leaving no one behind, and with innovative approaches to financing the organization to support its normative role. It stresses the need for a transformed governance structure that includes universal membership, a small, strong Policy Board and the formal involvement of local authorities/subnational governments and other urban stakeholders to provide input and recommendations. It also recommends stronger, more inclusive partnerships generally with representative organizations of local governments and excluded urban groups.

Contents

		Page
I.	Global context	5
	A. Setting the scene	5
	B. The call for action: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the New Urban Agenda	8
II.	Background for the assessment of UN-Habitat	9
III.	Overview of UN-Habitat	10
	A. History and role of UN-Habitat within the United Nations system	10
	B. Work of UN-Habitat and the tensions between its normative versus its operational roles	11
	C. Governance structure and management	13
	D. Partnerships	14
	E. Financial capacity	15
	F. Assessed strengths and weaknesses	15
IV.	New horizons: implementing the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda	16
	A. Scope of the commitment	16
	B. Challenges	17
	C. Role of UN-Habitat: what is clear, what is contested, what needs to be clarified?	19
V.	Updating the mandate and capabilities of UN-Habitat to reflect the new Agendas	21
	A. Implications for the mandate of UN-Habitat	21
	B. Governance implications	23
	C. Partnership implications	28
	D. Financial implications	29
VI.	Conclusions	31
VII.	Recommendations	32
Annexes*		
I.	Biographies of members of the High-level Independent Panel to Assess and Enhance the Effectiveness of UN-Habitat	36
II.	Methodology of the assessment	39
III.	List of consultations	42
IV.	Questions to assess and enhance the effectiveness of UN-Habitat	44
V.	Summary of responses from Member States, United Nations agencies and stakeholders	46
VI.	Result of online questions and analysis	51
VII.	Urban work in the United Nations	55

* The annexes are being circulated in the language of submission only and without formal editing.

VIII. Partnerships of United Nations entities 58
IX. Recommendations from previous assessments of UN-Habitat 63
X. Bibliography 70
XI. Additional documents reviewed by the Panel 73

I. Global context

A. Setting the scene

1. The world of development has been slow to respond to urban concerns and to fully appreciate the deeply interdependent relationship between urban areas and the surrounding territory. Because cities and towns have been the major catalysts of economic growth and development, because services and resources are concentrated there, and because of the long-held perception that rural development would prevent migration to urban areas, attention has been focused on the seriousness of rural deprivation.[1] But with the ongoing transition to a primarily urban world, the most pressing development challenges globally are increasingly located and amplified in urban areas.[2]

2. The urban transformation is not just a challenge; it is also a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. The high population density of urban areas can make towns and cities more ecologically sustainable, more socially inclusive and more culturally diverse than rural settlements. The proximity of local governments to the populations they serve make urban areas ideal sites for citizen participation and democratic governance, as many local governments and communities around the world are already demonstrating through innovative initiatives that promote the co-creation of cities. There is also an encouraging proliferation of sustainability-oriented experiments in urban settlements and territories across the world.

3. To realize the potential, however, the challenges cannot be ignored. Urban populations continue to grow in much of the world, poverty and humanitarian crises and conflict are becoming increasingly urban phenomena, and the urban risks from climate change are intensifying. Concerted efforts, at the global, national and local levels and in both developed and developing countries, are urgently needed to address current challenges, alleviate increasing inequalities and anticipate future threats. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (encompassing the Sustainable Development Goals and building on the Paris Agreement adopted under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development) will not be met without serious attention to urban realities. The New Urban Agenda provides a road map for this ongoing transition and UN-Habitat, along with the entire United Nations development system, has a potentially critical role in supporting countries to effectively implement the 2030 Agenda.

4. Projections suggest that in 30 years, two thirds of the world's population will live in urban areas. Urban growth rates have started to level out in much of the world, but continue to be very high in much of Africa and Asia, where 90 per cent of the projected increase will occur and where resources are the most constrained and development challenges are the most intense.[3] Rural-to-urban migration plays a large role,[4] much of it to small and medium-sized towns and cities and to the expanding peripheries of cities, which often have unclear or overlapping

[1] Diana Mitlin and David Satterthwaite, *Urban Poverty in the Global South: Scale and Nature* (London and New York, Routledge, 2013).

[2] *World Economic and Social Survey 2013: Sustainable Development Challenges* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.13.II.C.1).

[3] United Nations, *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision, Highlights*, New York, 2014 (ST/ESA/SER.A/352).

[4] Cecilia Tacoli, Gordon McGranahan and David Satterthwaite, "Urbanization, rural-urban migration and urban poverty", working paper (London, International Institute for Environment and Development, 2015).

administrative jurisdictions.[5] The reality of the existence of highly mobile concentrations of people in areas not classically considered urban cannot be overlooked. In fact, a hard rural-urban dichotomy has diminishing relevance; territorial approaches do greater justice to the complex continuum of rural to urban migration, although they also present new challenges to planning and land tenure regimes.

5. The urban transition is essential to economic growth. Yet this basic reality is still unrecognized by many major actors, from national Governments to international institutions, resulting in policies that limit migration in an attempt to slow urbanization and restrict the access of local urban governments to development financing.[6] Despite the restrictions, urban migration continues, and in the absence of inclusive and supportive policies and investment, this means limited opportunity for hard-pressed new residents, growing backlogs in provision of services, increasing informality and the disappearance for many residents of the vaunted "urban advantage". In many countries, for example, while rural child mortality rates are improving, in urban areas they are stagnating or becoming worse.[7] Poverty, hunger, disease, vulnerability to disaster, violence: these are all becoming increasingly prevalent in many urban areas.[8] The urban transition will be more or less complete in 50 years.[9] If it is not steered constructively now, the urban dividend could in many more places become a disaster marked by inequality, exclusion, inadequate provision of basic services, humanitarian crises and growing civil strife.

6. Formal figures show the urban share of global poverty rising, while the share and absolute number of those in rural poverty declines.[10] There is no reliable assessment of the numbers in urban poverty however, as those who face serious deprivation tend to remain undercounted. Informal settlements are often excluded from censuses and surveys; poverty lines do not take account of the higher cost of urban living; and assessments of poverty usually rely on averages, which can be deceptive in urban areas where disparities are high and where concentrations of wealth mask the true depth of poverty.[11]

7. A third of the urban population is estimated to live in slums and informal settlements, often without access to proper housing, infrastructure or services. In Africa, this figure is closer to 60 or 70 per cent. The proportion is declining in some countries, but absolute numbers continue to rise.[12] Unable to afford the formal land

[5] David Satterthwaite, "Small and intermediate urban centres in sub-Saharan Africa", working paper No. 6 (International Institute for Environment and Development and Urban Africa Risk Knowledge, 2016).

[6] Gordon McGranahan, Daniel Schensul and Gayatri Singh, "Inclusive urbanization: can the 2030 Agenda be delivered without it?", *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 28, No. 1 (April 2016), pp. 13-34.

[7] E. W. Kimani-Murage and others, "Trends in childhood mortality in Kenya: the urban advantage has seemingly been wiped out", *Health and Place*, vol. 29 (September 2014), pp. 95-103; and Mark Minnery and others, "Disparities in child mortality trends in two new states of India", *BMC Public Health*, vol. 13, No. 1, (2013), p. 779.

[8] Mitlin and Satterthwaite, *Urban Poverty in the Global South*; Caroline Moser and Cathy McIlwaine, "New frontiers in twenty-first century urban conflict and violence", *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 26, No. 2 (October 2014), pp. 331-344; and Donald Brown and others, "Urban crises and humanitarian responses: a literature review" (London, Development Planning Unit, University College London, 2015).

[9] *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision*.

[10] Martin Ravallion, Shaohua Chen and Prem Sangraula, "New evidence on the urbanization of global poverty", background paper for the World Development Report 2008, No. 4199 (Washington, D.C., World Bank, 2007).

[11] Mitlin and Satterthwaite, *Urban Poverty in the Global South*.

[12] United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), "The state of the world's cities 2012/2013: prosperity of cities" (Nairobi, 2012).

and rental markets, many urban residents have no option but to live in these unauthorized settlements, often lacking legal property rights, the benefits of citizenship, access to credit, insurance and the rule of law, and even the right to vote. They may also face the threat of eviction, often without warning, recourse or alternatives for relocation. Many more cope with chronic insecurity.[13] Informal solutions are basic to the survival of the urban poor; but these solutions, which are intrinsic to urban development in most of the world, can end up perpetuating and deepening poverty and inequality. Ever growing numbers of people are locked into these informal solutions, which act as a brake on a sustainable urban future.[14]

8. The challenges in poor urban settlements are intensified in many areas by the mounting hazards associated with extreme weather.[15] Cities, with their concentrations of population and assets, face high levels of risk, especially in coastal or riverside locations. Urban economies of scale and proximity can give cities a strong adaptive capacity, but the benefits seldom extend to all parts of a city. Informal settlements are often in the most hazardous locations, such as flood plains, hillsides at risk of landslides and sites close to industrial wastes, and unserved by the protective infrastructure that allows people to withstand extreme conditions, such as roads, drains, early warning systems and emergency services. Residents living in poverty also have more limited capacity to prepare for, withstand and recover from a range of weather extremes.[16] These same extremes, along with conflict, are pushing more people into towns and cities. By 2016, 80 million people globally were displaced by conflicts and disasters.[17] The numbers keep climbing, and more than half now end up in towns and cities, adding to the burdens faced by overtaxed local authorities. Full blown conflict, often over access to land and scarce urban resources, has also become an increasingly common feature of urban areas, contributing to the emergence of the new category of the "fragile city".[18]

9. Decentralization has moved many basic government responsibilities to the local level. Yet these mandated and growing responsibilities are seldom accompanied by the resources that are necessary to meet them.[19] Even in the absence of resources and of more generally redistributive policies however, local governments have the most critical role to play in addressing the growing challenges, through, among other things, equitable land management systems, regulations that do not discriminate against the informal solutions of the poor, a commitment to inclusive service provision and a willingness to engage with the self-help strategies of organized groups of the urban poor.[20]

---

[13] Leilani Farha, "Forced evictions: global crisis, global solutions" (Nairobi, UN-Habitat, 2011).

[14] Mitlin and Satterthwaite, *Urban Poverty in the Global South*; and Martha Chen, Sally Roever and Caroline Skinner, "Urban livelihoods: theory and policy", *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 28, No. 2 (October 2016), pp. 1-12.

[15] Aromar Revi and others, "Urban areas", in *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability — Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects*, Christopher Field and others, eds. (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2014). Available from www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg2/.

[16] Noah Scovronick, Simon Lloyd and Sari Kovats, "Climate and health in informal urban settlements", *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 27, No. 2 (October 2015), pp. 657-678.

[17] Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre and Norwegian Refugee Council, "Global overview 2014: people internally displaced by conflict and violence" (Geneva, 2014). Available from www.internal-displacement.org/assets/publications/2014/201405-global-overview-2014-en.pdf.

[18] Robert Muggah, "Deconstructing the fragile city: exploring insecurity, violence and resilience", *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 26, No. 2 (October 2014), pp. 345-358.

[19] UN-Habitat, *The Challenge of Local Government Financing in Developing Countries* (Nairobi, 2015).

[20] Diana Mitlin, "With and beyond the state: co-production as a route to political influence, power and transformation for grassroots organizations", *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 20, No. 2 (October 2008), pp. 339-360.

10. Although there is a critical need for national Governments and the development assistance world to provide more support to local governments, also crucial is bridging the divide between these local actors and the larger global decision-making structures. The resources for financing development increasingly go beyond multilateral and bilateral aid to include domestic resources and international private sector funding outside the influence or purview of the United Nations.[21] The United Nations can play a role, however, in advocating for predictable, adequate, sustainable financing for development and the effective use of resources. Through advocacy and partnerships, the United Nations can also help to mitigate the unintended consequences of major infrastructure projects, which can, for instance, include upheaval and impoverishment for many households which can persist through generations if safeguards are not observed.

B. The call for action: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the New Urban Agenda

11. Recognizing the critical need for action on pressing urban issues, government representatives at the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III), held in Quito in 2016, adopted the New Urban Agenda, in which the links between urbanization and development and the crucial need for inclusive and sustainable urban growth are emphasized. The ambitious 2030 Agenda, adopted a year before the New Urban Agenda, provides a critical overarching road map for this effort. The 17 Sustainable Development Goals, designed to stimulate action in areas critical for humanity and the planet, include Goal 11, to make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. Without attention being paid to this urban-oriented Goal and to the urban implications of the other 16 Goals, none of the Goals is likely to succeed. Together, the New Urban Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals point the way for cities to be part of sustainable global development. Equally important in this endeavour are the Paris Agreement on climate change, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

12. To ensure the capacity of the United Nations system to meet the challenges of the 2030 Agenda and the New Urban Agenda, the Secretary-General has initiated a system-wide review of the functions and capacities of the United Nations development system, which must, of necessity, pay close attention to the urban implications of the new Agendas and the capacity and commitment of the larger system to address them. UN-Habitat, as one of the important actors in this effort, has a key role in the coming years, but one that needs to be clarified and strengthened.

13. To support the 2030 Agenda, the United Nations development system must integrate a transversal urban perspective in responding to all related goals. In addition to advocating for the potential of cities to achieve development ambitions, UN-Habitat needs to contribute to the global normative framework, policies and standards for urban development, guided by intergovernmental processes that bring in key urban stakeholders, including local governments, the private sector and urban-poor groups, as well as to support the mainstreaming of urban development and urbanization throughout all the efforts of the United Nations system.

[21] United Cities and Local Governments, *Basic Services for All in an Urbanizing World: Third Global Report of United Cities and Local Governments on Local Democracy and Decentralization — Gold III* (Barcelona, 2013); and UN-Habitat, "The enhanced normative and operational framework: promoting sustainable urbanization at the country level", medium-term strategic and institutional plan 2008-2013. Available from http://mirror.unhabitat.org/downloads/docs/ENOF_FA.pdf.

14. It will also be essential to address the fact that the current funding for UN-Habitat is inadequate to meet the programme's needs and that the financing of urban development globally needs to be transformed. Most of the current investment in urban areas comes from the private sector and corporate interests.[22] The United Nations development system must move beyond a focus on intergovernmental transfers to one that ensures that all international and national investment, both public and private, is subject to democratic oversight, protects the commons and respects human rights, and that it is aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals.

II. Background for the assessment of UN-Habitat

15. The Panel responsible for the present report was established pursuant to paragraphs 172 and 173 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 71/256 to undertake an independent, objective, evidence-based review and assessment of UN-Habitat and to make recommendations to enhance the effectiveness, efficiency, accountability and oversight of the programme in four specific areas: mandate, governance, partnerships and financial capacity. This assessment coincides with the Secretary-General's own system-wide review, and the Panel hopes that its report will complement and feed into that wider review. The report is to be submitted to the General Assembly in September 2017 during its seventy-first session. Biographies of the Panel members are provided in annex I to the present report.

16. The Secretary-General, in a meeting with the Panel, encouraged it to make bold and ambitious recommendations, taking into consideration the challenges and opportunities posed by urbanization, their impact on global development, peace and security and the importance of leaving no one behind.

17. During the period of the review, from April to the end of July 2017, the Panel, as charged, assessed the following:

(a) The normative and operational mandates of UN-Habitat;

(b) Its governance structure and its capacity for more effective, accountable and transparent decision-making, and potential alternatives;

(c) Its work within the United Nations system, as well as with national, subnational and local governments and relevant stakeholders, so as to tap the full potential of its partnerships;

(d) Its financial capability and constraints.

18. The Panel has considered both the evolution of UN-Habitat and the broader context of the United Nations system. It has conducted broad consultations with Member States and various actors and stakeholders in order to come up with recommendations to enhance the programme's effectiveness, efficiency, accountability and oversight to support the achievement of the New Urban Agenda and the 2030 Agenda, including the Sustainable Development Goals.

19. In preparing the report, the Panel also drew on a literature review, field trips, interviews and Panel discussions and analysis. Consultations and workshops were held during the process, including with representatives of the Governing Council, the Committee of Permanent Representatives, the Executive Director and the senior management of UN-Habitat; key partners in multilateral organizations; associations of local authorities and regional governments; urban economists; youth and women's groups; and other relevant stakeholders (see annex II). The Panel also

[22] UN-Habitat, "The enhanced normative and operational framework".

consulted representatives of multiple United Nations organizations and specialized bodies, such as the World Bank institutions (see annex III). A questionnaire was also sent out to Member States, urban experts, United Nations organizations, civil society organizations, academic institutions and other actors and stakeholders (see annex IV). There was little response from United Nations organizations, but significant participation of Member States, urban experts and civil society groups (see annexes V and VI). Given the short time available for its work, the Panel also relied on evidence from previous evaluations and assessments (see annex IX). In addition, discussions reflected the perspectives of the extended networks and associations of Panel members. With close consideration being given to different opinions and perspectives, the present report reflects the consensus views of the Panel.

20. In section III, the report outlines the Panel's assessment of the current situation of UN-Habitat, in section IV, the new imperatives introduced by the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda are considered, and section V covers the implications for UN-Habitat and the Panel's recommendations for the organization.

III. Overview of UN-Habitat

A. History and role of UN-Habitat within the United Nations system

21. UN-Habitat is an entity of the United Nations, established in 1978, with its headquarters in Nairobi. It has four regional offices (for Africa in Nairobi, the Arab States in Cairo, Asia and the Pacific in Fukuoka, Japan, and Latin America and the Caribbean in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil), six liaison and information offices (in New York, Geneva, Brussels, Madrid, Moscow and Beijing) and 55 country offices. It is present in 63 countries through its technical cooperation programme and the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation special purpose activities. UN-Habitat plays both normative and operational roles globally. The distinction between these roles will be more fully discussed below. The organization focuses its work on four priority areas:

(a) Urban legislation, land and governance;

(b) Urban planning and design;

(c) Urban economy and municipal finance;

(d) Urban basic services.

22. It is also active in risk reduction, rehabilitation and resilience-building; housing and slum upgrading; and research and capacity development. Cross-cutting issues are also indicated in its plan, namely, gender equality, youth development, climate change and human rights. The evolving mandate of UN-Habitat has emanated from the three Habitat conferences since 1976.

23. **Habitat I, Vancouver, Canada**. In 1976, the magnitude and consequences of rapid urbanization were recognized in the Vancouver Declaration on Human Settlements. Pursuant to recommendations made in that Declaration, the Commission on Human Settlements and the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements were first established and they together became Habitat in 1978. Action plans were recommended in the areas of settlements policies and strategies, settlements planning, shelter, infrastructure and services, land and public participation.

24. **Habitat II, Istanbul, Turkey**. In 1996, the Istanbul Declaration on Human Settlements and the Habitat Agenda elaborated on the conference objectives, defining a mandate for Habitat, including adequate shelter for all, sustainable equitable human settlements development, the eradication of poverty, economic and social development and environmental protection, with respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Habitat was subsequently strengthened and created as a programme in 2002: the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat).

25. **Habitat III, Quito**. In 2016, sustainable urbanization was placed firmly on the agenda when the New Urban Agenda was adopted as the outcome document of Habitat III. This has been seen as an historic opportunity to leverage the key role of cities and human settlements as drivers of sustainable development in an increasingly urbanized world. One recommendation was to strengthen the role of UN-Habitat as one of the focal points for the implementation of the New Urban Agenda.

26. Although UN-Habitat is acknowledged for many competencies, the Panel recognizes that there is a concern among Member States and partners that, in its current state and with its existing capacities, UN-Habitat is unable to respond adequately to the immense challenges presented by the dramatic transformation of human settlements around the world, including rapid urbanization and increased global interconnectedness. It is vital that both UN-Habitat and the wider United Nations system are fit for purpose if the far-reaching objectives set by the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda are to be achieved. The present report aims to determine how UN-Habitat can best be supported and revitalized to take on an effective role in contributing to the achievement of these ambitious agendas.

B. Work of UN-Habitat and the tensions between its normative versus its operational roles

27. UN-Habitat, as previously noted, plays both a normative and an operational role. While there are areas of overlap, its normative work applies to the sphere of norms, policies, standards and frameworks, while its operational work refers to the tangible, technical projects on the ground, undertaken ideally with reference to those normative guidelines. The strategic priority areas of UN-Habitat involve, of necessity, both normative and operational competence, and in order to meet its objectives, it needs to work simultaneously at both the policy and the technical level. Its three-pronged approach involves legal (rules and regulations), economic (financial planning) and urban design aspects. Its enhanced normative and operational framework[23] focuses on providing a bridge between its normative and operational work, integrating policy and programming, and ensuring that work on the ground feeds into a larger shared vision. In fact, however, the organization's operational work often has little relevance to its normative mission.

28. The normative activities of UN-Habitat generally take the form of training programmes, policy guidance, promotion of good urban management governance and the compilation of research and data on global trends in urban and human settlements.[24] In theory, this normative work takes precedence over operational projects. But the technical cooperation activities of UN-Habitat are much sought

[23] UN-Habitat, "The enhanced normative and operational framework".

[24] United Nations Evaluation Group (2012). Professional Peer Review of the Evaluation Function of UN-Habitat. Available from https://unhabitat.org/uneg-professional-peer-review-of-the-evaluation-function-of-un-habitat/.

after by donors and governments, and maintaining a complementary balance between these activities and the normative work has been problematic. In his report on repositioning the United Nations development system to deliver on the 2030 Agenda (A/72/124-E/2018/3), the Secretary-General refers to this as a challenge for the United Nations system wide, in part due to the funding approaches of member Governments and other partners. Several discussions of the issue and its implications for the new development agenda are current' taking place.[25]

29. Broadly, the normative work of UN-Habitat is supported by non-earmarked core funding, while its operational work, typically including field projects, is supported by technical cooperation funds and special purpose funds, by far the greater part of the budget.[26] While both normative and operational outputs are expected, target proportions are not established.[27] Both UN-Habitat staff and other stakeholders, however, indicate that far more operational than normative work is actually taking place,[28] a fact supported by the disproportion in budget allocations. Decreasing core funding has left UN-Habitat little choice but to solicit operational work beyond the United Nations, affecting its capacity to focus on strategic priorities and normative work.[29] Many highly valued projects are donor-driven technical cooperation projects that do not promote scalability and therefore also weaken the normative mandates of UN-Habitat. Despite their investment in these projects, many Member States are concerned by the dearth of normative work, and do not like to see the organization acting like a consulting agency,[30] driven by interests that may not be aligned with the strategic guidance of the Governing Council. Panel members registered a clear sense from stakeholders that UN-Habitat needs to strengthen its normative role and ensure that operational work informs the normative agenda.

30. There is also a concern that results and lessons learned at the operational level are not feeding as intended into the normative work, and that UN-Habitat faces a challenge in scaling up pilot projects into normative outputs.[31] Finally, there is the danger that operational work unlinked to normative objectives may undermine normative aims. Large operational development projects, for instance, may corner

[25] John Burley and Douglas Lindores, "The United Nations development system and its operational activities for development: updating the definitions", report prepared for the Department of Economic and Social Affairs for the 2016 quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system, February 2016; United Nations Evaluation Group, "Handbook for conducting evaluations of normative work in the United Nations system", guidance document, November 2013. Available from www.unesco.org/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/IOS/temp/UNEGHandbookNormativeWorkENG.pdf; and "ECOSOC dialogue on the longer-term positioning of the United Nations development system in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", working paper by the independent team of advisers appointed by the Bureau of the Economic and Social Council (June 2016). Available from https://www.un.org/ecosoc/sites/www.un.org.ecosoc/files/files/en/qcpr/ita-findings-and-conclusions-16-jun-2016.pdf. UN-Habitat has also reflected on these roles in the report of the Executive Director on the proposed work programme and budget for the biennium 2016-2017 (HSP/GC/25/5) and in *UN-Habitat Global Activities Report 2015. Increasing Synergy for Greater National Ownership* (Nairobi, 2015).

[26] Proposed work programme and budget for the biennium 2016-2017 (HSP/GC/25/5), Strategic Plan 2014-2019 (HSP/GC/24/5/Add.2) and *UN-Habitat, Global Activities Report 2015*.

[27] UN-Habitat, "Mid-term evaluation of the implementation of UN-Habitat's strategic plan, 2014-2019", April 2017.

[28] High-level Panel consultation with UN-Habitat senior staff, 6 May 2017.

[29] Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network, "United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat): Institutional Assessment Report", 2015-2016.

[30] High-level Panel consultations and questions on UN-Habitat assessment.

[31] United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Department for International Development, "Multilateral aid review: assessment of United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)", (London, March 2011).

funding that might otherwise support more local groups, limiting their input into decisions that affect their lives and thus hampering the normative orientation towards local engagement.

C. Governance structure and management

31. UN-Habitat is governed by three main bodies: a Governing Council of 58 Member States that decide on overall policy and strategy, the Committee of Permanent Representatives, composed of 94 Member States accredited to UN-Habitat, and a secretariat, which deals with day to day management and includes the Office of the Executive Director. The Panel finds that this structure will need to be enhanced to ensure proper oversight by Member States, with clear division of responsibilities and accountability and a capacity for timely and responsive decision-making and action.

32. There are several reasons for the structure's shortcomings. The Governing Council provides overall direction, but it meets only every two years and has limited capacity to respond to concerns as they arise. The Committee of Permanent Representatives meets four times a year and it monitors and reviews Governing Council resolutions, but has no decision-making power. Its oversight role was recently strengthened with the formal establishment in 2015 of the Working Group on Programme and Budget, in accordance with Governing Council resolution 25/7 on UN-Habitat governance reform. This 15 member group provides oversight, reviews budgets, work programmes and audits, and reports to both the Committee of Permanent Representatives and the Governing Council. Even with this extended oversight, however, there are concerns that the Committee's lack of authority, and the participation of Committee members which are not also members of the Governing Council, leads to bottlenecks and inefficiency, and that in effect the Council and Committee together offer limited feedback on strategic and substantive issues.

33. The secretariat, as an executive organ of UN-Habitat, translates the decisions of the Governing Council into strategies, programmes and initiatives, which it manages and monitors, and provides strategic recommendations. While the General Assembly approves regular budget allocations and the Governing Council approves general purpose budget allocations, the special purpose budget and technical cooperation contributions are approved by the Executive Director. This has been problematic, given the changing nature of the funding of UN-Habitat, with its increasing reliance on technical funds. It means that most of the budget does not come under the oversight of the governing bodies, which include Member States, leading to questions about accountability and strained trust between Member States and the secretariat. This is compounded by the fact that reporting for operational projects is limited to client countries, so that information submitted to the Governing Council does not include full details on performance.

34. There have been several discussions in recent years on the need for an internal reform of UN-Habitat, but no agreement has been reached among Member States. Taking into account the governance challenges identified during the governance review of the Committee of Permanent Representatives and the UN-Habitat secretariat (see HSP/GC/22/2/Add.3 and HSP/GC/23/INF/7), **the Panel agrees that the current governance model suffers from systemic problems that affect its accountability, transparency, efficiency and effectiveness.**

D. Partnerships

35. UN-Habitat's strategic partnerships include political actors, civil society, professional organizations and the private sector, both as advocates of sustainable urbanization and as implementers and monitors of national urban policies and programmes (see annex VIII for a full list). There are good reviews from many Member States and stakeholders on the success of UN-Habitat in mobilizing partners. Reviews are less positive on efforts to incorporate partners' voices into policy design and operational activities.

36. UN-Habitat also has representational presence in several countries, through regional offices, liaison and information offices and country offices. It works with different partners, United Nations and non-United Nations, government and non-government. Habitat Agenda partners include a range of organizations outside central government and UN-Habitat has established a number of thematic networks composed of a cross section of these partners. Other key collective partners include the Global Urban Observatory, the General Assembly of Partners, the partners that attend the biennial World Urban Forum and the World Urban Campaign.[32]

37. Several United Nations organizations work on urban issues and urban development, and each of these has its own established partnerships (see annex VII) that could potentially be directly or indirectly integrated into work on urban issues. Similarly, UN-Habitat works in many areas where other United Nations organizations, as well as external actors, have specific competences, for example, on public health issues related to urban areas (World Health Organization); urban land and matters related to food security that arise with urban expansion (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, World Bank, Slum Dwellers International, civil society organizations); pollution, the circular economy and sustainable consumption and production, sustainable built environments, climate adaptation and mitigation, and specific projects on coastal cities (United Nations Environment Programme); children in urban settings (United Nations Children's Fund); urbanization of refugee camps, rural to informal migration and temporary to permanent refugee settlements in cities (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)); urban migration (International Organization for Migration); safe cities (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women)); HIV/AIDS in cities (Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS); decentralization and local governance, and affordable housing policies (United Nations Development Programme); and municipal finance capacity-building and decentralization of national and international funds to cities (United Nations Capital Development Fund). Currently, however, there are no institutional mechanisms to coordinate the work with other organizations to avoid duplication, increase efficiency or enhance policy integration.

[32] The UN-Habitat Global Urban Observatory monitors global progress in implementing the Habitat Agenda as well as global urban conditions and trends. The General Assembly of Partners is an innovative, inclusive and independent multi-stakeholder partnership platform that convenes more than 1,100 unique organizations with over 58,000 networks working on sustainable urban development. The World Urban Forum is the world's premier conference on urban issues and has become one of the most open gatherings in the international arena for exchanging views and experience on urban challenges. The World Urban Campaign is an advocacy and partnership platform to raise awareness about positive urban change to achieve green, productive, safe, healthy, inclusive and well-planned cities. Its goal is to place the New Urban Agenda at the highest level in development policies.

E. Financial capacity

38. As noted by the Secretary-General in his report on the reform of the development system, core funding allocated to the United Nations system has declined over the past 10 years and it continues to decrease (A/72/124-E/2018/3, para. 112); this is affecting the entire family of the United Nations institutions.[33] It is most painfully evident in the case of UN-Habitat and this has implications for the nature of the organization's work and for its credibility. UN-Habitat has three sources of funding: United Nations regular budget allocations, UN-Habitat and United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation contributions and technical cooperation contributions. Regular budget funding and general purpose funding from the Foundation have been steadily decreasing (amounting to about 7 per cent of budget in 2016, or 11.5 per cent if overhead is included) and UN-Habitat has had to increase its reliance on its technical cooperation portfolio and its special purpose funding from the Foundation, which together amounted to over 88 per cent of overall funding in 2016.[34]

39. This trend towards a reliance on operational funding has, as noted above, some major impacts. It affects the capacity of UN-Habitat to focus on strategic priorities and its normative work and has raised concerns from some Member States, as also previously noted, that UN-Habitat is becoming more like a consulting agency, thereby harming its global and regional role in setting norms and standards and developing policy. Fund mobilization tends to be donor-driven, taking a practical path but one that does not encourage predictable and sustainable funding and that leads to programmes that may not be in line with mandates.[35] The trend also affects accountability. Because the Governing Council and the Committee of Permanent Representatives lack control and full oversight over the technical cooperation budget, there is, again as noted, a lack of trust and growing tensions around the control and monitoring of the funding and activities UN-Habitat. Cuts in financing have been linked directly to this issue by some donors. It is, as some Panel members have pointed out, a self-perpetuating chicken-and-egg process. As the organization strays further from its mandate, it loses the trust of its funding sources. This in turn pushes it to rely more on the very work that discredits it. Donors have signaled that they will link their level of engagement with UN-Habitat with forthcoming governance reforms.

F. Assessed strengths and weaknesses

40. UN-Habitat has been recognized over the years for its work on local governance, decentralization, sustainable urbanization and human settlements through its enhancement of urban-rural linkages, its expertise in urban policies and frameworks, its mobilization of partners, its work with local governments and local stakeholders, and its pro-poor focus and work with marginalized groups. In its

[33] Global Policy Forum, "Assessed contributions to United Nations specialized agencies". Available from https://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/133-tables-and-charts/27480-assessed-contributions-to-un-specialised-agencies.html; and Bruce Jenks and others, "Financing the United Nations development system: current trends and new directions" (Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation and the United Nations Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office, 2016). Available from www.daghammarskjold.se/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Financial-Instr-Report-2016-Final-web.pdf.

[34] Presentation on the financial situation of UN-Habitat to the High-level Panel by the Director of the Office of Management, UN-Habitat, 6 May 2017.

[35] UN-Habitat: Institutional Assessment Report, 2015-2016; Proposed work programme and budget for the biennium 2014-2015" (HSP/GC/24/5); and "Mid-term evaluation of the implementation of UN-Habitat's strategic plan, 2014-2019", April 2017.

resolutions 69/226 and 70/210, however, the General Assembly has recognized that the responsibilities of UN-Habitat have changed considerably in scope and complexity. The Panel observes that UN-Habitat is having little impact on the United Nations development system, and is seen by many of the stakeholders interviewed by Panel members as too weak an organization to fully meet its mandate and act on its potential.

41. The Panel acknowledges the challenges that UN-Habitat and the wider United Nations system face, and that these challenges have compromised the ability to respond nimbly and effectively to rapid global change. It agrees that UN-Habitat has limitations in accountability, transparency and efficiency, and that its resources have been inadequate, insecure and unpredictable, with implications for the capacity to meet its evolving mandate. Its mix of operational and normative functions, often not linked, is also a challenge, and the need to chase funds has undermined its mandated responsibility to take a normative lead.

42. The present time, in which the Sustainable Development Goals are being monitored and the Paris Agreement and the New Urban Agenda have come into force, creates an unprecedented window of opportunity to integrate an urban perspective across the United Nations system and to strengthen the leadership and legitimacy of UN-Habitat so it can fulfil its mandate and address the transversal nature of the New Urban Agenda and the far reaching and universal ideals of the Goals. **Recognizing that UN-Habitat has a focal role in addressing sustainable urbanization, but faces challenges that compromise its capacity to respond effectively, the Panel recommends that the first priority must be to save, stabilize and then rapidly strengthen UN-Habitat to equip it for a renewed role based on the 2030 Agenda and the New Urban Agenda.**

IV. New horizons: implementing the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda

A. Scope of the commitment

43. The Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda, endorsed by national Governments in September 2015 at the United Nations summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda, represent an ambitious, transformative global framework for sustainable development — social, economic and environmental — with a primary commitment to leaving no one behind. The Secretary-General's recent report on repositioning the United Nations development system to respond to the 2030 Agenda (A/72/124-E/2018/3) stresses the bold, paradigm-shifting nature of the 2030 Agenda and the need for the United Nations system to ready itself in equally bold ways to support it.

44. Yet the Secretary General's report makes virtually no reference to urban areas or to the very specific work that will be involved on this front. This failure to reference the urban context as a significant aspect of the larger task reflects a more general failure within the United Nations system and the development assistance enterprise to recognize the extent and the implications of the urban challenge. It is also evident within the text of the 2030 Agenda, which focuses explicit attention on urban concerns in only one of its 17 Goals (Goal 11, which calls for making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable).

45. Yet urban areas, with their growing majority of the global population, their concentration of both economic risk and potential, their vulnerability to climate-related disasters and their relationships with surrounding areas, are not just relevant to realizing the 2030 Agenda, they are central to its success and to the stage on

which the Sustainable Development Goals will or will not be achieved. Most of the Goals necessarily have urban implications and without significant attention to urban realities in all their manifestations and complexity, the ambitious objectives of the Goals cannot be realized.

46. The 2030 Agenda recognizes the extent to which achieving these objectives can be undermined by the hardening of exclusion around the world. The Sustainable Development Goals include many far-reaching political goals and targets regarding inclusion, empowerment and equality and they stress the elimination of extreme poverty and hunger and the reduction of all poverty as part of leaving no one behind. Much of the exclusion in question is closely tied to the global resistance to urbanization.[36]

47. The Sustainable Development Goals are clear on what needs to be achieved, but not on how or by whom. Meeting the objectives of the 2030 Agenda will, to a large extent, be the aggregation of local achievements, requiring the efforts of effective, accountable and well-financed local governments, along with private enterprises, civil society and communities; yet these are generally overlooked. This lack of attention is reflected in the language of the Goals, which emphasizes primarily the tasks of countries rather than municipalities. These global goals and targets need to be translated into frameworks that support local actors and there is a critical need for better understanding, support and funding for local action.

48. The many Sustainable Development Goals that can be substantially realized by good local governance and urban policies form the basis for the New Urban Agenda, adopted as the outcome document of Habitat III a year after the 2030 Agenda was adopted. Although it builds on the Goals, the New Urban Agenda also reaffirms General Assembly resolutions dating as far back as the 1970s (31/109, 51/177, 56/206, 67/216, 68/239 and 69/226). The New Urban Agenda, in practical terms, aims to operationalize the urban-related Goal 11 and the urban implications of all the Goals. While the New Urban Agenda acknowledges the importance of local actors, it is a national Government agenda and national Governments need to comply, addressing in that respect the implications for local action in order for local actors to be empowered.

49. In short, the transformative and inclusive goals of the 2030 Agenda and the New Urban Agenda are clear. Less evident in both of the Agendas is the means by which they can be realized, especially in urban areas at the local level. There are some distinct challenges in this regard.

B. Challenges

50. An initial conceptual challenge is the definition of "urban", which varies from country to country. **The Panel calls explicitly for a conceptual shift to a more territorial approach, focusing on metropolitan regions, including the cities, towns, peripheral areas and villages that they contain.** Small towns beyond metropolitan regions, where a lot of rapid growth is occurring, must also be included as a critical part of the urban reality, along with rural-urban links, so that the broader human settlements focus remains. This more territorial frame avoids the oversimplification of the rural-urban dichotomy and the risk of positioning cities and rural areas in opposition to one another, in competition for scarce development resources. It emphasizes links and acknowledges that the issues affecting local

[36] McGranahan, Schensul and Singh, "Inclusive urbanization, pp. 13-34.

people go way beyond local areas and that solutions require the coordinated attention of different governance levels and multiple actors.[37]

51. Within the United Nations system, as noted above, there is not a full acknowledgement of the pace, scale and implications of urbanization, which remains a niche issue in the development discourse. This is true also for many Member States, which still lack national policies that accept the reality and the potential of urbanization and development strategies that take into account the complex continuum of urban realities. Many countries have weak, underfinanced urban ministries, if they have one at all, and most of their ministers still focus on rural concerns. Attention to rural concerns is justified, but these countries are poorly prepared to cope with the current and future challenge of urbanization. Achieving the objectives of the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda requires that countries align their legislative and institutional realities with their commitments.

52. Beyond the need to accept the central importance of urban realities is the failure to focus on the essential contribution of local and subnational government in addressing development challenges. This gap between global commitments and local agendas will have to be bridged for successful implementation by all partners. This will require renewed attention to decentralization and multilevel governance and, in many places, the strengthening of institutional capacity, which can be especially weak in underresourced local governments.

53. Also neglected has been the role of civil society. The language of inclusion in the new Agendas is a start. But it is also important to distinguish between participation as a project deliverable and the genuine partnership that inclusion implies. Many urban-poor groups have been effectively working with local government partners to tackle their basic needs for secure housing, adequate provision of services and decent livelihoods. Their attention to the challenges of informality, and especially the treatment of eviction, are critical, as is their empowerment of women. Many are well represented nationally and even globally by networks and federations that link their organizations within cities and beyond, and they are powerful political voices for their members, facilitating their inclusion and their contribution. To ignore the resourcefulness, expertise and deep experience they can bring to the table is unrealistic, given the scale of the challenge.

54. Considerable resources will be needed, both for building the capacity of institutional actors to manage their responsibilities, but also for meeting the large and growing shortfalls globally with regard to the most basic needs of urban residents. The necessary resources are far greater than can be met by development assistance bilaterally and by the United Nations system and, in addition to a rethinking of the aid architecture, flows of both private and public investment will have to be tapped and coordinated.

55. Another area not adequately reflected in these agendas is the growing manifestation of humanitarian crises and emergency situations in urban areas. These have profound effects for the development agenda, given the destruction of infrastructure that can be involved and the large numbers of refugees and displaced people who are increasingly heading to urban areas, contributing to the growing burden for local governments and to the risk of xenophobic responses from other

[37] Francesco Bicciato, "The territorial approach to sustainable human development: the ART Initiative", paper presented at the III CUCS Congress, Turin, Italy, September 2013; and United Nations Development Programme, "An integrated framework to support local governance and local development" (2016). Available from www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/local_governance/integrated-framework-to-support-local-governance-and-local-devel/.

urban dwellers.[38] As noted by the Secretary-General in his report on repositioning the United Nations development system (A/72/124-E/2018/3), this calls for a rethinking of the traditional separation of development assistance from humanitarian work.

56. The extensive capacity to support Member States in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and the expertise to tackle the institutional and financial architecture underpinning this support, is spread over multiple United Nations agencies and organizations. The New Urban Agenda is a transversal agenda that requires urban attention to be integrated into the work of every United Nations organization, with systems and approaches in place to measure and track progress. The Secretary-General points out, however, the major risk of inefficient overlaps (A/72/124-E/2018/3, para. 48). The task of ensuring that the implementation of the New Urban Agenda is mainstreamed throughout the United Nations system is a large one and, arguably, not one that aligns well with the advocacy and normative work that UN-Habitat needs to undertake.

57. Meanwhile, it is a challenge to focus on specific recommendations for UN-Habitat if the United Nations system itself is not prepared to address urbanization as a phenomenon that is going to affect all of its agendas. This is a recipe for the continued marginalization of UN-Habitat and its mandate. Despite the Secretary-General's call for bold recommendations by the Panel, this limitation must be acknowledged. Given that the reform of the larger United Nations system is still a situation in flux, the Panel acknowledges how critical it is that UN-Habitat have an agile capacity for flexibility and for identifying and seizing opportunities as they arise.

C. Role of UN-Habitat: what is clear, what is contested, what needs to be clarified?

58. UN-Habitat is nominally the representative within the United Nations system for sustainable urbanization. There are divergent views, however, on the role it should take with regard to the New Urban Agenda and the urban implications of the Sustainable Development Goals. It is a small body on the margins of the United Nations system and its budget and capacity do not come close to meeting the scope of its mandate. Nor, in the minds of most of the stakeholders with whom the Panel spoke or conducted surveys, does it have the strength or credibility to take a lead role in this regard.

59. Some Member States do believe that UN-Habitat should have a prominent role and lead the implementation of the New Urban Agenda; but most of the countries that responded to the Panel's survey are strongly of the opinion that the implementation of the Agenda cannot be the mandate of a single organization and that it will require effective collaboration between various United Nations entities and relevant stakeholders, drawing on the expertise of each.

60. The Panel found value in the New Urban Agenda statement regarding the importance of the role of UN-Habitat within the United Nations system as "a" focal point on sustainable urbanization and human settlements, including in the implementation, follow-up and review of the Agenda, in collaboration with other United Nations system entities (General Assembly resolution 71/256, annex, para. 171). The Agenda urges UN-Habitat to continue to develop normative knowledge and provide capacity development and tools to national, subnational and

[38] Diane Archer and David Dodman, "The urbanization of humanitarian crises", *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 29, No. 2 (2017) (forthcoming).

local governments in designing, planning and managing sustainable urban development (ibid., para. 129). Along with other United Nations programmes and agencies, UN-Habitat is encouraged to generate evidence-based and practical guidance for the implementation of the new Agendas (ibid., para. 128). UN-Habitat is also mandated by the New Urban Agenda to coordinate the quadrennial report on its implementation, in close collaboration with other relevant entities of the United Nations system (ibid., para 168).

61. The Panel, taking various views and directives into account, recognizes that the United Nations system has yet to define a strategy or mechanism on how different United Nations entities will address the implementation of the New Urban Agenda and the urban implications of the 2030 Agenda, and specifically of Goal 11. It also has broader concerns about the more general strategy within the development system for addressing urbanization. Until a clearer mechanism is defined, **the Panel feels that UN-Habitat is the appropriate United Nations entity to play an advocacy role around the importance of urban issues and the significance of the local agenda, within and outside the organization, and to expand and refine its normative work in these respects. In this capacity, it would assist and support Member States, United Nations organizations and other stakeholders to integrate the New Urban Agenda and urban aspects of the Sustainable Development Goals into their development operations as appropriate, providing guidance and tools for strengthening urban work at the country level.**

62. In particular, the Panel sees UN-Habitat taking a leadership role in two specific areas. The first involves work on urban planning, legislation, norms and standards and on national urban policy, including attention to decentralization, governance and capacity-building. The second is the area of urban equity, addressing vulnerabilities and exclusion and ensuring that informal settlements and their implications are fully recognized and addressed.

63. These two areas are closely related. Urban equity and the issue of informality have to be dealt with through policies and appropriate planning and standards. At the same time, policy, planning and standard setting must be informed by prevailing realities, including the extent of informality and exclusion, and the changes that are anticipated in urban areas. Addressing informal settlements and accepting an expanded definition of what "urban" means both have major implications for planning norms, land tenure regimes and access to basic amenities. Regardless of the commitment to inclusion, people can continue to be left behind by policies and planning that do not work for them.

64. Given that the Panel seeks a larger role for urban locales in the fulfilment of the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda (as well as other agreements), it recognizes the need for support beyond the functions it envisions for UN-Habitat. It urges the formation of a new United Nations mechanism to perform the work of coordinating all the partners involved and encouraging their involvement in the necessary transition to a development focus that recognizes the work to be accomplished in urban locations. The establishment of such a mechanism would create the space for UN-Habitat to focus on and refine its normative mission, emphasizing the central mandate of the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda to leave no one behind. **The Panel proposes that UN-Urban be established as a coordinating mechanism similar to UN-Water and UN-Energy, as part of the system-wide United Nations reform, with a small secretariat based in the Department of Economic and Social Affairs in New York.**

65. UN-Urban, as a committee of actors for all United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, would ensure that the United Nations system in its entirety is addressing urban issues and implementing the New Urban Agenda. It would provide a platform for the United Nations to operationalize the Sustainable Development Goals within the urban setting, addressing the cross-cutting nature of urban development and bringing coherence to activities and commitments, with the various entities drawing on their particular strengths and avoiding duplication. UN-Urban would enhance the urban operational work of the United Nations system and, the Panel believes, would in turn enhance UN-Habitat's work. A similar model to UN-Urban would be that of UN-Energy and UN-Water, which include all United Nations entities with related operational activities as equal members. The Panel appreciates this model also for its inclusion of stakeholders in addition to United Nations entities as partners. These stakeholder partners in the case of UN-Urban could include representatives of international organizations, professional unions and associations or other civil society groups that are actively involved in urban development and that have the capacity and willingness to contribute tangibly to the work of UN-Urban. UN-Habitat (playing its normative role) and UN-Urban would together bring entities to the table, making it possible for intersectoral and transversal conversations to take place. UN-Urban, although it would be independent of UN-Habitat, would coordinate with UN-Habitat's governance structure.

V. Updating the mandate and capabilities of UN-Habitat to reflect the new Agendas

66. Responding to the New Urban Agenda and the 2030 Agenda means that UN-Habitat must redirect its focus towards one of the most critical global challenges in human history: the transition from a primarily rural to an urban existence for humankind. Because of this stunning shift in mission, UN-Habitat needs to be engaged at the highest, universal levels of the United Nations. The transition involves all countries, developed and developing, in every region of the world.

67. Urbanization moreover has the potential, as noted previously, to address many of the primary goals within the Sustainable Development Goals. With strong governance, sustainable cities can simultaneously address development, poverty, social isolation, economic opportunity, mobility, services, housing, health and, of course, climate change. Urban proximities of scale and economic agglomeration provide a huge potential for policies and programmes that can generate multiple benefits and that should engage the interest and involvement of the full range of Member States. This involves not only a redefined mandate, but also a new governance structure that can support new levels of engagement and financing strategies that can provide UN-Habitat with the scope to respond to its expanded mandate.

A. Implications for the mandate of UN-Habitat

68. It has emerged clearly in the work of the Panel that the current imbalance between normative and operational activities in the work of UN-Habitat is not viable and that normative work should take precedence. All are agreed that operational work can be strategic in terms of realizing a normative mission. Much of the operational work currently dominating the activities of UN-Habitat, however, is not driven by a larger vision, but by the need to respond to supply-driven opportunities as a source of revenue. It is not just a matter of correcting the ratio of

operational and normative work, but of ensuring that the two are linked and that the normative mission drives all activities, regardless of the ratio. The challenge is to guarantee that UN-Habitat is not pushed to take on projects that do not align with its larger mandate. **The Panel recommends that all operational work has a clear linkage to normative priorities** and a tighter connection to the overall strategic policy and governance oversight.

69. Correcting and aligning this balance depends on strong leadership and on addressing the critical resource constraints faced by UN-Habitat, both of which are discussed below. It also depends on a clarification of the organization's priorities. **The Panel recommends two priority areas in this regard: attention to equity, vulnerability and exclusion in urban development; and a focus on the urban planning, legislation, norms and standards that will best support equitable development priorities along with environmental sustainability and economic robustness.**

70. Yet greater clarity is still required with regard to the normative mission. Despite repeated assertions on the primacy of the normative mission, not only in UN-Habitat but throughout much of the United Nations system, the concept remains elusive and imprecise. To some degree this reflects an inherent ambiguity in the concept of normative, which covers both "the right way to do things" and "the right reason for doing them". At its extremes, this normative work might include training on planning methodologies, but also debates on the values that inform that planning. The Panel has focused primarily on the former, but urges UN-Habitat to keep both understandings in mind in defining and operationalizing its normative mission.

71. **The Panel recommends that, with the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda as guiding frameworks, the core of the normative role of UN-Habitat be precisely to keep in focus the directive to leave no one behind, a directive amply supported by the human rights frameworks endorsed by the United Nations system. It implies advocacy and oversight with Member States to ensure their urban work reflects this guiding imperative, as well as guidance on the best means for achieving this end.**

72. This means, for instance, ensuring that governments and their partners can both acknowledge and understand the negative repercussions of informality, as well as taking the planning and legislative steps necessary to deal with it. The informal solutions of the poor, whether in housing, amenities or livelihoods, provide immediate ways to cope with their exclusion, yet also reproduce that exclusion. Designating activities or places as informal provides governments with the power to displace, harass, criminalize and generally complicate the lives of the poor, when regulatory and planning frameworks could also be used to acknowledge and support informal solutions. There are numerous practical examples. **The Panel recommends that UN-Habitat provide guidance on both the practical approaches to dealing equitably with informality, and the values informing them.**

73. This means tackling formal frameworks so that informality is unnecessary, addressing land tenure laws, land ownership patterns and development planning approaches that force the production of informality. It means monitoring evictions and developing strong legislative solutions to ensure that unavoidable displacement is addressed with sustainable relocation, which must be included in project budgets.

74. Through its government partners, UN-Habitat also needs to mediate conflicts between powerful development interests and powerless informality and to ensure that marginalized communities and the civil society groups representing them are given due consideration in the development of urban policies and decisions around planning, with a seat at the table where possible. The private sector, whether local or global, should be asked to develop their own responsibility norms in this context.

75. This value-oriented normative work is closely tied to the operational work that UN-Habitat and other partners take on. In many localities, new solutions on the ground are urgently needed to produce normative outcomes that can be adopted and taken to scale by other partners. A database of programmes and projects, analysed with a view to identifying the ways these perspectives can inform one another and contribute to the understanding and implementation of the larger normative mission, would contribute to an evolving, iterative understanding. **The Panel recommends clear documentation on the complementarity of normative and operational work, with clarity on the way the normative — operational distinction is being interpreted in every project.**

76. Meeting the objectives of the new Agendas requires significant work in many practical areas of urban development (basic service delivery, climate change mitigation and adaptation, emergency response and safe cities to name just some). More energy needs to be directed to encouraging the rest of the United Nations system to bolster these efforts, with UN-Habitat developing solutions in some cases, but always helping to maintain the focus on inclusion as essential to the balanced and sustainable implementation of urban development. The integrative imperative of the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda implies a shift in the way organizations work, and UN-Habitat has a role in making this happen.

77. Critical here is improved data to support the task. The mission of UN-Habitat of addressing inclusion within urban areas points to some very specific gaps. The large proportion of urban dwellers living in informality are frequently undocumented in formal data systems, especially the growing number of refugees coming into urban areas rather than formal emergency camps. Even where data are collected there is the issue of disaggregation. Data are most often presented in terms of rural and urban averages and this fails to reflect the complexity of the urban landscape and the large disparities within urban areas. In his report, the Secretary-General stresses that disaggregation is key to leaving no one behind and underlines the need to improve the United Nations system's ability to properly manage data to encourage new insights (A/72/124-E/2018/3, para. 39). Efforts to document the full range of urban realities, whether by strengthening formal systems or supporting existing informal strategies, such as the detailed surveys carried out by urban-poor federations, are essential to the task.[39] National reporting on the Sustainable Development Goals must entail an overlaying of multiple forms of local data, including and beyond citizen-led data in informal settlements, city-government reported standardized data, satellite data and big data. **The Panel recommends that UN-Habitat, in its data support role, pay special attention to the gaps in data collection and analysis that obscure the realities of excluded groups.**

B. Governance implications

78. The Panel finds that the governance and management structure of UN-Habitat has not met the organization's need for effective, responsive and timely decision-making, nor has it permitted the level of oversight by Member States that would ensure its reputation for accountability and transparency. These concerns have led to a decline in political commitment by Member States and have contributed to resource constraints in an environment where regular funding has in any case become scarcer and less predictable. A further concern, clarified by the direction of the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda, is the insulated

[39] Anni Beukes, "Making the invisible visible: generating data on 'slums' at local, city and global scales", working paper (London, International Institute for Environment and Development, 2015). Available from http://pubs.iied.org/10757IIED/.

nature of the current UN-Habitat governance structure, which signally fails to reflect the complexity of the development landscape with its multiple actors.

79. A new governance structure is called for that resolves trust issues and generates a new and broader level of engagement. The Panel suggests some fundamental changes. The first is universal membership of all 193 Member States (rather than the current 58 members in the Governing Council). The second is the addition of a Policy Board, smaller and more focused than the current Committee of Permanent Representatives (which would however remain), which would integrate formal input from stakeholders, local governments and UN-Urban.

80. The case for universal membership is very clear in the view of the Panel. The far-reaching transversal agenda of sustainable urbanization, understood as the territorial development described above, requires system-wide approaches and the development of global positions informed by the experience and realities of all Member States. Those that have gone through the urban transition and those that are experiencing rapid urbanization can together develop policy that can help promote inclusive and sustainable development, avoiding the rural-urban divide that persists in international discussions. Urbanization and its social and environmental implications and the resources it requires are hugely significant although not yet fully understood. This understanding needs to be developed together by all Member States, not just a few. The balance between and within regions is another key reason for universal membership in the UN-Habitat governance structure. It is to be hoped that universal membership will also enable broader ownership and more open, participatory and transparent proceedings, providing all Governments with an equal voice in the decisions needed to support urbanization and create a more inclusive and sustainable world.

81. The case for the inclusion of a broader range of non-United Nations members is equally strong. Mayors, civil society representatives, private-sector actors and many other local stakeholders are primary agents in implementing urban development and will be essential for realizing the transformative objectives of the new Agendas. Many of these local actors now attend UN-Habitat events and were key players in the construction of the New Urban Agenda, but there is no formal mechanism in the organization's governance structure or its accountability framework for the involvement of these partners. Acknowledging and institutionalizing their valuable contributions through a formal role would address the mandate for inclusion directly within the governance of the organization, demonstrating the depth of its commitment.

82. In arriving at its recommendation, the Panel gave serious consideration to a variety of possible governance models. The Panel's optimal solution would have included, in addition to universal membership, a formal mechanism for the full participation of local government and representatives of other urban stakeholders as members of a tripartite governance body. There is a precedent for such a structure in the tripartite governance structure of the International Labour Organization, which includes a governing body with membership of 50 per cent Member States and 25 per cent each of representatives of employers and workers. The Panel takes note, however, of present legal limitations to a similar tripartite structure for UN-Habitat. Understanding that at present there is no chance to pursue this optimal solution, a fact the Panel regrets, the Panel presents instead a variation on that model that it is advised is legally possible. **The Panel recommends a new governance structure that includes, in addition to universal membership, committees of local authorities and subnational governments and of urban stakeholders, with the capacity to evaluate and review resolutions and to offer their coordinated guidance to the Policy Board.**

83. To accommodate this requirement, the Panel recommends the following hybrid governance structure, as shown in the figure below, for UN-Habitat, which mirrors the structure of the United Nations Environment Programme with its universal membership, but also provides a formal mechanism for a Committee of Local Governments and a Committee of Stakeholders.

Proposed structure for UN-Habitat governance



84. This new governance structure would be governed by the Urban Assembly, the ultimate decision-making body providing overall strategic framework and direction for the work of UN-Habitat. It differs from the current Governing Council primarily in its universal membership, the case for which has been outlined. The Urban Assembly would meet every two years, alternating years with the World Urban Forum so that Forum outcomes can be integrated into the UN-Habitat strategic plan. Its meeting could also be coordinated with the United Nations Environment Assembly, allowing a one-day joint meeting to discuss shared agenda issues and potential joint work programmes. To further enhance and promote the urban agenda, it could consider alternating its meetings between Nairobi and New York during the General Assembly sessions to take advantage of the potential of holding overlapping sessions. **The Panel recommends that UN-Habitat arrange its schedule and the location of its meetings to maximize the potential for overlap with both the United Nations Environment Assembly and the General Assembly.**

85. The Urban Assembly would approve work programme and budgets, define normative and operational expectations, nominate the members of the Policy Board, approve resolutions and recommendations by the Policy Board, with inputs from the Committee of Local Governments, the Committee of Stakeholders and the Committee of Permanent Representatives. It would also set the vision for fulfilling the Sustainable Development Goals and other commitments in the context of the urban and habitat agendas and champion the role and contribution of transformative urbanization, sharing and exchanging strategies and solutions.

86. The Urban Assembly would be assisted by the proposed Policy Board, consisting of 20 members, four from each of the regions, selected by the Urban Assembly for three-year terms and meeting biannually. The Policy Board represents the major change to the governance structure, an innovative addition that provides oversight on projects and policy and strategic advice to the Urban Assembly, but also ensures that its direction is informed by local governments and stakeholders as well as by Member States. The Policy Board is, in effect, the crossroads where all input is integrated. Its tasks are listed in the table below, along with those of the

Committee of Permanent Representatives. Among other things, the Policy Board would be critical to the effort to achieve greater transparency for the organization. Projects, whether normative or operational, would come before the Board for review on a twice-a-year cycle, with information maintained in an accessible database available to all to see, and any concerns could be taken up with the Board. This could resolve many of the trust issues.

87. The Committee of Local Governments would include 10 local/subnational government representatives, two each from each region; the Committee of Stakeholders would include 10 civil society representatives, five urban experts and five private sector representatives, also evenly spread over the five regions. Members of both Committees would be nominated by their representative bodies and elected by the Assembly for two-year, non-renewable terms. All partners would be eligible to submit applications.

88. These Committees would deliberate on the issues coming before the Policy Board and have formal input into all Policy Board decisions, with seats at the table and an ongoing feedback mechanism, ensuring that the Policy Board is well informed on a range of perspectives. Before discussions with the Policy Board, the two Committees would meet together to coordinate their deliberations. This would be a ground-breaking partnership, enabling local authorities and subnational governments along with urban stakeholders to provide input and strategic guidance on central governance issues.

89. In addition to the input of the Committees, the Policy Board would be informed by UN-Urban which, as a coordinating mechanism on urban matters, is crucial to the strategic direction of UN-Habitat. Its input on the urban work of United Nations entities and Bretton Woods institutions and the lessons learned would supplement the perspectives of the local government and stakeholder groups in informing Policy Board deliberations. A discussion on the most practical way of ensuring the regular input of both these important bodies needs to take place.

90. Recognizing the importance of Member States, the Committee of Permanent Representatives would retain its open membership and much of its current function, continuing to meet four times a year and its function as an oversight mechanism, in a complementary and supportive relationship with the Policy Board. It works directly with the UN-Habitat secretariat and Executive Director, with the aim of developing and bringing ideas, issues and information to the Policy Board.

Responsibilities of the Policy Board and the Committee of Permanent Representatives

Policy Board	*Committee of Permanent Representatives*
Primary management and coordination role	Provides input to the Policy Board on budget, operations and projects
Leads development of and updates the strategic plan	Provides input for the strategic plan
Reviews progress and products of major UN-Habitat initiatives	Reviews specific activities and reports to the Policy Board
Prepares resolutions for the Urban Assembly	Helps to develop resolutions
Reviews and approves annual budget and projections prepared by the Executive Director	Reviews annual budget and projections with the Executive Director

Policy Board	*Committee of Permanent Representatives*
Oversees fundraising activities	Supports fundraising strategies
Prepares reports for the Urban Assembly	Reviews overview report for the Urban Assembly every two years
Interacts with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, the Urban Assembly, the secretariat and the Committees	Interacts only with Policy Board and the Executive Director/secretariat

91. The Executive Director would report to the Policy Board on work programmes and budgets, including technical cooperation and earmarked projects. A well-defined set of criteria, including the potential for scalability, should provide the basis for the approval of technical cooperation and earmarked projects, which should always support the normative mandate. The roles and functions of the secretariat are to remain the same. The Panel recognizes the multiple reporting lines associated with the Executive Director's responsibilities, including to the Economic and Social Council, the Executive Office of the Secretary-General and the Fifth Committee on budget. Reporting to the Policy Board, however, represents the internal relationship of the secretariat to the organization's governance structure.

92. This revamped and transformed governance structure is intended to be effective, inclusive, transparent and accountable, so as to address the transversal nature of the urban agenda, increase engagement with United Nations operational entities to more effectively mainstream urban issues in United Nations operational work and allow for the participation of local government authorities and urban stakeholders. Every attempt would be made to ensure that their involvement is substantive and meaningful, despite the fact that under the Charter of the United Nations they cannot be voting members.

93. The location of these governance bodies is also critical. The Panel agrees that in order to strengthen its governance and management, UN-Habitat needs to capitalize on the comparative advantages of having its headquarters in Nairobi, which places the organization in one of the fastest urbanizing regions and makes its location extremely relevant to its work.

94. The linkages and relationship with the Secretariat in New York where some budgeting decisions are made and where the United Nations Headquarters is located should also be strengthened for improved governance and management. **For better coordination, and stronger, closer relationships to United Nations entities in New York, the Panel recommends a stronger staff presence in New York, especially of senior level staff.**

95. The Panel believes UN-Habitat should also review the location of its regional offices and consider moving them to cities where the regional commissions reside. The report of the Secretary-General on repositioning the development system elevates these commissions to think tanks at the regional level to provide world class analysis and knowledge on region-wide priorities, innovation, financing for development and transboundary issues. Relocating and aligning UN-Habitat regional offices would ensure that UN-Habitat has access to enhanced research and analysis of regional issues to support its normative and operational work and in turn build solid evidence from its own urban normative work. This would mean moving from Rio de Janeiro to Santiago (Latin America and the Caribbean); from Fukuoka to Bangkok (Asia and the Pacific); from Cairo to Beirut (Arab States); and from Nairobi to Addis Ababa (Africa).

96. New York is not the only place that requires a stronger staff presence. **Building on existing capacity within UN-Habitat, other organizations and the best available talent worldwide, the Panel recommends that UN-Habitat staffing be more generally adjusted in Nairobi, New York and the regional offices, with gender-parity to meet its mission and mandate to support Member States, subnational governments and United Nations country teams.**

C. Partnership implications

97. The success of the role of UN-Habitat depends on acknowledging governments at different levels, but also the many non-state actors critical to urban development, including civil society and the private sector. This acknowledgement is expressed in practical terms through its partnerships. Assessment of the partnerships of UN-Habitat points to the organization's success in mobilizing partners, but raises questions about the quality of the involvement that ensues and about the programmatic activities that emanate from the partnerships. Also to be considered is an emphasis on the partners that can best strengthen the focus on inclusion within the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda.

98. The inclusivity at the heart of the reframed mission of UN-Habitat has significant implications for its partnerships. Partnerships predicated on a mission of genuine inclusion, not just the delivery of participation as a project deliverable, imply a seat at the table for stakeholders that might not historically have occupied that position. This new framing of partnership is reflected in the Panel's recommended governance structure, which, for the first time, offers local and subnational governments and other stakeholders a more prominent role, moving from mere engagement to active collaboration. A critical element will be the means by which these representatives are selected, which should ideally be based on self-organization by their representative bodies.

99. In his report on repositioning of the United Nations development system, the Secretary-General emphasizes that the United Nations development system will need to respond to national demands for inclusive alliances and participatory planning processes that take account of the needs of the most vulnerable and excluded (A/72/124-E/2018/3, para. 43). Within the UN-Habitat governance system, as well as its more general approach to partnership, this implies a need to give priority to partners that share this commitment to the vulnerable and excluded and that have experience and proven successes to bring to the table.

100. As the levels of government most engaged with addressing exclusion on the ground, local and regional governments must be high on the list of the partnerships of UN-Habitat. At present, UN-Habitat engages subnational governments primarily through Member States in the General Assembly. The Panel sees the need for more direct relationships to facilitate the shift to the local level agenda which must be an intrinsic part of the New Urban Agenda. This is accomplished in part by the Committee of Local Governments and the Committee of Stakeholders, but a wider set of relationships may also be useful through, for instance, organizations representing local governments or excluded urban groups. **The Panel recommends exploring relationships with representative organizations of local government and of civil society, as well as strengthening partnerships with United Nations country teams and the regional commissions.**

101. The engagement of UN-Habitat with the private sector is an important aspect of its normative work. Since the private sector plays such a large role in urban development, often with far-reaching negative consequences, especially for excluded groups, **the Panel recommends that UN-Habitat explore ways to**

encourage private sector actors to look at the unintended negative impacts of their investments and find ways to mitigate them.

102. As well as developing its own partnerships, UN-Habitat has a role to play in encouraging, facilitating and strengthening other important partnerships, such as those between national and subnational levels of government, especially local governments, which, despite the rhetoric on decentralization, still largely lack the independence and financial resources to adequately assume the full range of their responsibilities. The all-important relationship between local governments and civil society, especially organizations representing excluded groups, is also critical. This relationship is central to tackling urban exclusion and informality. Even for progressive local governments that are committed to civil society participation, there are important differences between putting participatory mechanisms into place for local residents and building relationships with existing organizations representing excluded groups, including women and the urban poor. Many of these organizations have long-standing relationships with local residents, a good understanding of the realities on the ground and a track record for co-production with local governments in addressing many of the material and political deficits facing excluded urban citizens.[40]

103. Beyond the partnerships that directly address exclusion, there are the partnerships that can help underwrite and support this work. The financial strengthening that is essential for UN-Habitat, as for the rest of the United Nations development system, calls for partnerships that make it possible to tap new sources of funding, as more fully explored in the following section of the present report.

104. Also essential here is the engagement of UN-Habitat in the work of UN-Urban, with its role in convening and coordinating the entities within the United Nations system and beyond to tackle the important work of inclusive and sustainable urbanization.

105. The World Urban Forum is a useful platform for convening partners and facilitating partnership; the Panel recommends that it become a permanent event so that it would not require approval and fundraising every two years. **The Panel recommends institutionalizing the World Urban Forum to help maintain the New Urban Agenda firmly on the global agenda. Furthermore, it proposes that outcomes from the Forum be integrated into the strategic plan, work programme and budget of UN-Habitat. This should be done through a report on outcomes to be submitted to the Policy Board for integration into resolutions for the Urban Assembly.**

D. Financing implications

106. The unpredictable and insufficient funds available for the core functions of UN-Habitat, along with its governance problems, have underpinned its other weaknesses. More secure funding for the organization is urgently needed not only to strengthen its performance more generally, but also to allow it to carry out its role effectively with regard to the New Urban Agenda and to support countries in their efforts to deliver its mandate. It is essential both that regular Member State contributions be increased to support this urban work, but also that innovative new financing modalities be explored.

107. The most immediate concern is the additional funding required to support the redefined focus of UN-Habitat on normative work. This means, first of all, an increase in the non-earmarked funds committed by Member States. While their

[40] Mitlin, "With and beyond the state".

assessed contributions to the regular budget are based on an agreed formula, there is scope for Member States to make additional voluntary contributions to non-earmarked funds within the Human Settlements Foundation. This in turn means stimulating the enthusiasm of Member States for the mission of UN-Habitat and renewing their confidence in the organization and the way money is managed and spent. Concerns about transparency are largely addressed in the governance section above, and there is the hope that the revamped structure will encourage an increase in core funding. It is also hoped that universal membership will result in a more general commitment to urban work, which will be reflected in more expansive support. Annual budgets and mission-related outcomes, aligned with priorities set by the United Nations development system which would be tracked annually and independently reviewed every four years, should assist in matching stable financing arrangements with the expenditure framework and medium-term plan. Having the right accountability mechanisms in place will help to secure funding for UN-Habitat. **To activate this support, the Panel proposes an urgent call for Member States to support UN-Habitat with multi-year committed funds. In addition, the Panel recommends that UN-Habitat develop a four to five year medium-term perspective plan and expenditure framework.**

108. The Panel has noted some concern on the part of Member States about the proportion of their voluntary contribution that goes to staffing and other administrative costs as opposed to normative work, since this distinction is not easily extracted from available information concerning budget categories. To add to other measures to enhance transparency, **the Panel also recommends that UN-Habitat specify the percentage of core funds spent on staffing and other administrative costs and that a cap be put on this amount.**

109. Another way to strengthen support for normative work is to increase the share of resources that can be spent on normative activities. In keeping with the drive for transparency, it can be made clear to donors and governments seeking technical cooperation and special purpose projects that UN-Habitat does not take on projects without this normative component and that all projects have to meet certain criteria with regard, for instance, to their contribution to knowledge, innovation and scalability, as well as more generally to sustainability and inclusion. **The Panel recommends that a proportion of all earmarked technical cooperation funding be dedicated to this linkage to the normative mission and strongly proposes a limit to the earmarked funding from Member States that goes to operational work.**

110. The Panel feels a further solution might be converting the UN-Habitat regular budget allocation into a grant, giving the organization more managerial flexibility and responsiveness while allowing it to remain part of the United Nations Secretariat. The grant modality currently allows UN-Women and UNHCR to apply the same financial rules and regulations as other funds and programmes that are not funded by the United Nations Secretariat. While it would not change planning and reporting requirements, the grant modality could improve the efficiency and capacity of UN-Habitat to use resources flexibly.[41] **The Panel recommends that UN-Habitat explore the advantages of the grant modality.**

111. Beyond the stimulation and effective use of existing resources, the Panel is clear that new innovative sources of financing need to be explored, not only for UN-Habitat activities, but for the more general mission of promoting sustainable and inclusive urbanization. A recurring theme in the Panel's consultations has been the view that the United Nations more generally should go beyond traditional and

[41] Stein-Erik Kruse, "Governance options: governance review process: UN-Habitat", February 2013.

diminishing funding and convene different stakeholders to tap other resources, public and private, including global funds and funds from specialized banks. **The Panel recommends that UN-Habitat develop a strategy for cooperation with multilateral banks, financial institutions and private sources of finance in order to increase the available resources for inclusive and sustainable urbanization.**

112. Another potential source of new funding is the local actors that are heavily involved and committed to the urban agenda. The inclusion of local and subnational government authorities and other stakeholders in the work of UN-Habitat through the Committee of Local Governments and Committee of Stakeholders is not only a chance to draw on their expertise, but more generally to represent and encourage their involvement as partners and as contributors to the larger enterprise. **The Panel recommends that UN-Habitat explore the funding and fundraising potential inherent in its relationships with local actors.**

113. A useful focal point for new sources of funding could be the kind of multistakeholder platform that would be represented by a dedicated fund. Such a fund would be similar to the Fund for Gender Equality, a multi-donor initiative dedicated to programmes that increase women's economic opportunities and/or political participation at local and national levels. This would provide a multistakeholder platform for UN-Urban to mobilize partnerships and increase funding to support relevant urban work, with a percentage allocated to UN-Habitat's normative and policy integration work. This financial platform could facilitate new equitable and inclusive urban governance strategies, with UN-Habitat assisting and supporting nation States to explore these possibilities. This potentially catalytic global fund could help to mobilize partners and attract new donors to fund globally relevant projects. Examples of new partners and donors include the private sector (such as companies and infrastructure banks) and philanthropic organizations. The United Nations system already provides tax deductible benefits, which should further compel philanthropic organizations to support such a fund. The Panel agrees that the expansion of funding modalities needs to be based on total transparency and disclosure of accounts to both Member States and donors, to ensure credibility and to attract future donors. **The Panel proposes a dedicated global fund to secure a platform for alternative funding for sustainable urbanization efforts.**

VI. Conclusions

114. The Panel was convened to assess the performance of UN-Habitat and its potential for responding to the new aspirations and commitments assumed by Member States under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the New Urban Agenda. The Panel reached consensus in many areas and agreed that while UN-Habitat faces significant constraints and has critical weaknesses, its role is now more important than ever.

115. Urban challenges are substantial and growing, along with urban populations, and thus sustainable development globally will increasingly be tied to what happens in urban areas. Given the need to reconcile this inevitable reality with the generally scant attention paid to urban concerns within the 2030 Agenda and the larger vision of the United Nations system, an urban champion is vitally important and necessary. The work of this champion cannot substitute for the concerted efforts of the entire United Nations system and its Member States, with their multiple layers of government, but it can help to steer and inform these efforts, ensuring that the urban focus remains steady, that it is grounded in the imperative in the Sustainable Development Goals to leave to one behind and that it fully acknowledges and supports the local actors who are on the front lines in realizing the objectives.

116. This role for UN-Habitat has been further refined by the Panel through the identification of two closely linked priorities: to address exclusion in urban areas and especially the constraints imposed by informality; and to support and provide guidance on responsive national urban policies and on urban planning and legislation. "Urban" is clearly defined here as encompassing the full range of urban realities, including the entirety of metropolitan regions, expanding urban peripheries, rapidly growing small towns and the important links between human settlements on every scale.

117. For UN-Habitat to play this role, its systemic limitations must be addressed: its problematic governance structure with its lack of Member State oversight, its growing financial constraints, and its portfolio of resource-driven activities that have increasingly allowed it to stray from its normative mission. Clear steps have been recommended for addressing these very interwoven concerns: universal membership in its governance structure, with strong representation also from local actors; a renewed commitment to a work programme defined by its normative mission, and specifically by the priority given to inclusion; and the creative exploration of new funding modalities to accompany its efforts to secure more predictable and substantial contributions from Member States and other sources.

118. The Panel recognizes, in addition to this role, the need for considerable coordination in the effort to encourage Member States and other partners and facilitate their efficient cooperation. It has also proposed the establishment of UN-Urban as a coordinating mechanism that can supplement and facilitate the more normative role of UN-Habitat.

119. The Panel was urged to make bold recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness, efficiency, accountability and oversight of UN-Habitat, ensuring that it could be fit for the purpose of addressing the requirements of sustainable inclusive urban development. Being fit for this purpose implies transparency, responsiveness to a rapidly changing global and urban landscape, the flexibility to seize opportunities as they arise and to take action in the face of evolving challenges, and the capacity to be inclusive in its own governance as well as promoting inclusion as a more general value. The Panel would like to register its concern about the potential for bold recommendations in the context of legal and administrative constraints that represent de facto curbs. Its most pressing recommendation is for the larger United Nations reform process to consider how it can remove the institutional road blocks that inhibit innovative solutions, in order to more effectively realize its far reaching and transformative objectives for the world.

VII. Recommendations

The Panel's charge

120. The Panel responsible for the present report was established to undertake an independent, objective and evidence-based review and assessment of UN-Habitat and to make recommendations to enhance the effectiveness, efficiency, accountability and oversight of the programme in four specific areas: its normative and operational mandates, its governance structure, its partnerships and its financial capacity (see paras. 15 and 17 above).

The role of UN-Habitat

121. Recognizing that UN-Habitat has a focal role in addressing sustainable urbanization but faces challenges that compromise its capacity to respond effectively, the Panel recommends that the first priority should be to save, stabilize

and then rapidly strengthen UN-Habitat to equip it for a renewed role based on the 2030 Agenda and the New Urban Agenda (see para. 42).

122. The Panel sees UN-Habitat as the appropriate United Nations entity to play an advocacy role around the importance of urban issues and the significance of the local agenda, both within the United Nations system and among external actors, and to expand and refine its normative work in these respects. In this capacity, it would assist and support Member States, United Nations organizations and other stakeholders to integrate the New Urban Agenda and urban aspects of the Sustainable Development Goals into their development operations as appropriate, providing guidance and tools for strengthening urban work at the country level (see para. 61).

123. To complement the role of UN-Habitat, the Panel proposes that UN-Urban be established as a coordinating mechanism similar to UN-Water and UN-Energy, as part of the system-wide United Nations reform, with a small secretariat based in the Department of Economic and Social Affairs in New York (see para. 64).

The mandate of UN-Habitat

124. The Panel recommends that, with the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda as guiding frameworks, the core of the normative role of UN-Habitat be to keep in focus the directive to leave no one behind, a directive amply supported by the human rights frameworks endorsed by the United Nations system. This implies advocacy and oversight with Member States to ensure that their urban work reflects this guiding imperative, as well as providing guidance on the best means for achieving this end (see para. 71).

125. The Panel further recommends that all operational work should have a clear linkage to normative priorities and a tighter connection to the overall strategic policy and governance oversight (see para. 68).

126. The Panel recommends two priority areas in this regard: attention to equity, vulnerability and exclusion in urban development; and a focus on the urban planning, legislation, norms and standards that will best support equitable development priorities, along with environmental sustainability and economic robustness (see para. 69).

127. In particular, it is recommended that UN-Habitat provide guidance on informality as a driving force that is shaping exclusion. This includes both the practical approaches to dealing equitably with informality and the values informing those approaches (see para. 72).

128. Clear documentation on projects is recommended, demonstrating the complementarity of normative and operational work and the way the normative — operational distinction is being interpreted in every project (see para. 75).

129. In defining the term "urban", the Panel calls for a conceptual shift to a more territorial approach, focusing on metropolitan regions, including the cities, towns, peripheral areas and villages that they contain, and avoiding the oversimplification of the rural-urban dichotomy (see para. 50).

130. The Panel recommends that UN-Habitat, in its data support role, pay special attention to the gaps in data collection and analysis that obscure the realities of excluded groups (see para. 77).

Governance

131. The Panel agrees that the current governance model suffers from systemic problems that affect its accountability, transparency, efficiency and effectiveness

and it recommends some fundamental changes, focused on the need for involvement by all Member States and a capacity to reflect the complexity of the urban development landscape with its multiple actors (see paras. 34 and 79).

132. The Panel recommends a new governance structure that includes universal membership by all 193 Member States in an overarching Urban Assembly and the addition of a small, focused Policy Board to provide policy and strategic advice and oversight on projects. The Policy Board would integrate input from the Committee of Permanent Representatives, the UN-Habitat secretariat and the Executive Director, as well as from a committee representing local authorities and subnational governments and a committee representing urban stakeholders, both of which would have the capacity to evaluate and review resolutions and offer coordinated guidance to the Policy Board. UN-Urban would also advise the Policy Board (see para. 82).

133. The Panel recommends that the Urban Assembly arrange its schedule and the location of its meetings to maximise the potential for overlap with both the United Nations Environment Assembly and the General Assembly (see para. 84).

134. UN-Habitat should also have a stronger staff presence in New York, especially of senior level staff, to provide better coordination and create closer relationships with United Nations entities in New York (see para. 94).

135. UN-Habitat should, more generally, adjust it staffing in Nairobi, New York and its regional offices, with gender-parity, to meet its mission and mandate to support Member States, subnational governments and United Nations country teams (see para. 96).

Partnerships

136. With a view to creating and sustaining active, effective and inclusive partnerships that can contribute to realizing the mandate of inclusiveness, the Panel recommends that UN-Habitat explore and strengthen relationships with representative organizations of local government and civil society, as well as strengthening partnerships with United Nations country teams and the regional commissions (see para. 100).

137. The Panel also urges UN-Habitat to explore ways to encourage private sector actors to look at the unintended negative impacts of their investments and to find ways to mitigate them (see para. 101).

138. Finally, the Panel recommends institutionalizing the World Urban Forum to help maintain the New Urban Agenda firmly on the global agenda and proposes that the Forum outcomes should be integrated into the strategic plan, work programme and budget of UN-Habitat. This should be done through a report on the outcomes of the Forum to be submitted to the Policy Board for integration into the resolutions for the Urban Assembly (see para. 105).

Financial capacity

139. The Panel recommends that an urgent call be made for Member States to support UN-Habitat with multi-year, committed funds. In addition, it recommends that UN-Habitat develop a four to five year medium-term perspective plan and expenditure framework (see para. 107).

140. To encourage voluntary contributions from Member States, the Panel recommends that UN-Habitat specify the percentage of core funds spent on staffing and other administrative costs, and that a cap be put on this amount (see para. 108).

141. To strengthen the priority given to normative work, the Panel recommends that a proportion of all earmarked technical cooperation funding be specifically

dedicated to the normative mission, and strongly proposes that a limit be set for the earmarked funding from Member States that goes to operational work (see para. 109).

142. The Panel recommends that UN-Habitat explore the advantages of the grant modality, which would give the organization more managerial flexibility and responsiveness while allowing it to remain part of the United Nations Secretariat (see para. 110).

143. In order to explore new and innovative sources of funding and to increase the available resources for inclusive and sustainable urbanization, the Panel recommends that UN-Habitat develop a strategy for cooperation with multilateral banks, financial institutions and private sources of finance. The funding and fundraising potential inherent in local urban relationships could also be explored (see paras. 111 and 112).

144. Finally, the Panel recommends the creation of a dedicated global fund as a platform to secure alternative funding for sustainable urbanization efforts (see para. 113).

Annex I

Biographies of members of the High-level Independent Panel to Assess and Enhance the Effectiveness of UN-Habitat

Co-Chair: H.E. Rosario Robles, Secretary of Agrarian, Territorial and Urban Development, Mexico

Rosario Robles is the Secretary of Agrarian, Territorial and Urban Development of Mexico. She served as Federal Representative for the fifty-sixth Congress, from 1994 to 1997, Secretary of Government of Mexico City between 1997 and 1999, and in 1999, was sworn in as Mayor of Mexico City, the first and only woman to run the city. Ms. Robles served as President of the Party of the Democratic Revolution in 2002. Under the current Federal Government, from 2012 to 2015, she served as Secretary of Social Development, during which time she coordinated Mexico's new generation social policy and launched the "National Crusade against Hunger".

She holds a bachelor's degree in economics from the National Autonomous University of Mexico and master's degree in rural development from the Autonomous Metropolitan University. Her political career has been characterised by her dedication to empowering women and guaranteeing gender equality in the public sphere, and combating poverty.

Co-Chair: Hon. Mpho Parks Tau, President of United Cities and Local Governments and President of the South African Local Government Association

Mpho Parks Tau is the President of United Cities and Local Governments and the President of the South African Local Government Association. As a member of the Johannesburg Mayoral Committee President, from 2000 to 2011, Mr. Tau drove the city's socioeconomic transformation agenda. During this time, he headed the portfolios of Development Planning, Transport and Environment, and Finance and Economic Development. Mr. Tau served as the second democratically elected Executive Mayor of Johannesburg from 2011 to 2016. He is also the Chairperson of the South African Cities Network.

Mr. Tau holds a Post-Graduate Diploma in public management from Regenesys and a Master of Science in public policy and management from the University of London.

H.E. Pontso S.M. Sekatle, Member of Parliament for Qacha's Nek Constituency, Lesotho

Pontso S.M Sekatle is a Member of Parliament for Qacha's Nek Constituency and was elected in 2002, 2007, 2012, 2015 and 2017 General Elections. In June 2001, Dr. Sekatle was appointed to the Senate, and in July 2001 she became Minister of Health and Social Welfare. Following the 2002 General Elections she was appointed Minister of Local Government and Chieftainship and mandated to deliver the first local government elections since 1968. The first Local Government Elections were held in April 2005 and Dr. Sekatle handled the local government portfolio until 2012. Following the 2015 General Elections she was again appointed Minister of Local Government and Chieftainship.

Dr. Sekatle has headed various executive committees, such as the Lesotho Congress for Democracy Women's League and Democratic Congress Women's League. She also served as Deputy President for the African Association for Public Administration and Management; Deputy President for the Commonwealth Local Government Forum, Director of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and

Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) in Lesotho, and as board member of Lesotho National Development Corporation. She has published in the fields of public administration, governance and institution building.

Hon. Anne Hidalgo, Mayor of Paris, France

Anne Hidalgo is the Mayor of Paris, France, elected in 2014, the first woman in this position. She is a former labour inspector, having joined the Socialist Party in 1994. In 1997, she joined the cabinet of Martine Aubry, then-Minister for Employment and National Solidarity. As First Deputy to Bertrand Delanoë, Mayor of Paris, for 13 years, she headed the list of the Paris Left in its successes in the regional elections of 2004 and 2010. Mayor Hidalgo is currently President of the AIMF (Association internationale des Maires francophones), President of C40, Co-President of the UCLG and First Vice-President of the Greater Paris Metropolitan Area.

H.E. Dian Triansyah Djani, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Indonesia to the United Nations

Dian Triansyah Djani is the current Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations. Prior to his appointment, Ambassador Djani was the Director General for America and Europe, MoFA Indonesia. Between 2009 and 2012, he served as Permanent Representative to the United Nations, WTO and other International Organisations in Geneva.

From 2005 to 2008, Ambassador Djani was the Director General of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and member of the High Level Task Force on Drafting the ASEAN Charter. He was President of the UNCTAD Trade and Development Board (2009), Vice President of the UN Human Rights Council (2009), Chairman of the Second Committee of the 71st UNGA, as well as numerous positions in many international conferences/summits. He also served as the Commissioner of the Global Commission on Internet Governance. He pursued his graduate studies in Economic Development at the University of Indonesia and Vanderbilt University, United States of America.

H.E. František Ružička, Permanent Representative of the Slovak Republic to the United Nations

František Ružička is the Permanent Representative of the Slovak Republic to the United Nations. Prior to his appointment in 2012, Mr. Ružička was elected Chair of the Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) during the sixty-ninth United Nations General Assembly and was a member of the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing from 2013 to 2014. He also co-chaired the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Revitalisation of the Work of the sixty-eighth General Assembly.

Mr. Ružička's career has included numerous foreign posts. From October 2004 until his current appointment, he served as Director General of the European Affairs Section at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Bratislava. Between September 2003 and April 2005, he was Director of the Department for Internal Affairs and Institutions of the European Union. Previously, Mr. Ružička represented his country as a member of the delegation to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, Ambassador to Poland and in numerous posts at the Foreign Ministry.

Hon. Sheela Patel, Founder and Director of the Society for Promotion of Area Resource Centres (SPARC)

Sheela Patel is Founder and Director of the Society for Promotion of Area Resource Centres (SPARC) and a global expert on urban poverty alleviation and advocacy for slum dwellers. Ms. Patel founded SPARC in 1984, a Mumbai-based non-governmental organisation focused on housing and infrastructure rights for the urban poor. During this time, Ms. Patel has played a key role in the expansion of Mahila Milan, a federation of collectives of women living in slums across India.

Ms. Patel is also the Chair of Slum/Shack Dwellers International (SDI), an international network of organisations of the urban poor and supporting non-governmental organisations, active in Asia and Africa. She has represented SDI as a member or adviser in many national and international task forces and committees, including for multiple United Nations agencies.

Ms. Patel received the David Rockefeller Bridging Leadership Award from the Synergos Institute in recognition of her extensive efforts to ameliorate urban poverty, and Padmashree, a civilian award in India, for her work on urban poverty alleviation. She holds a Master of Social Work from the Tata Institute of Social Sciences.

Hon. Peter Calthorpe, Architect

Peter Calthorpe is an architect, urban designer, urban planner, and founding member of the Congress for New Urbanism. Mr. Calthorpe's career in urban design, planning, and architecture began in 1976, combining his experience in each discipline to develop new approaches to urban revitalisation, suburban growth, and regional planning. In 1983, he founded the award-winning firm of Calthorpe Associates, devoted to sustainable urban design and planning globally. He is a founder and the first board president of the Congress of New Urbanism.

In 1986, along with Sim Van der Ryn, Mr. Calthorpe published Sustainable Communities, a book that inspired new thinking in environmental design and helped launch sustainability as a defining goal of many ecological efforts. In the early 1990s, he developed the concept of Transit Oriented Development, highlighted in The Next American Metropolis, an idea that is now the foundation of regional policies and city plans around the world. His latest book, Urbanism in the Age of Climate Change, documents his work relating patterns of development to energy and carbon emissions, along with other environmental, social and economic impacts. Recently he led a ground-breaking state-wide urban design effort, Vision California, to inform the implementation of the state's climate change legislation. He studied at the Graduate School of Architecture at Yale University.

Annex II

Methodology of assessment

This assessment process took place within a four month period — April to July 2017. The methods used for the assessment included a review of the literature, field trips, consultations, survey questions (online and word), and Panel discussions and analysis. Given the short period of time available to conduct this work, the Panel relied on evidence and support from previous evaluations and assessments, as well as qualitative in-person and written interview consultations. The Panel made two trips to Nairobi and two trips to New York for this assessment and has considered all consultations and evidence, taking into account different opinions, versions, ideas and alternative scenarios.

Consultations

Prior to organising consultations with Member States and other relevant stakeholders for the Assessment of UN-Habitat, it was agreed among Panel members that for any consultation meetings to take place, there had to be at least two Panel members present. A series of consultations, both virtual and in-person, were held throughout the process with Member States and key stakeholders of UN-Habitat including representatives of the Governing Council (GC), the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) to UN-Habitat; the Executive Director and senior management staff of UN-Habitat; key partners in multilateral organisations; associations of local authorities and regional governments; urban economists; youth and women's groups; and other relevant stakeholders. The Panel also consulted multiple UN agencies and specialised bodies such as the World Bank institutions throughout this process. (See list of consultations in annex III). In Nairobi, the Panel had 17 group consultations and 10 bilateral meetings with Member States. In New York, the Panel held 6 group consultations and 4 individual consultations (with the Secretary-General and Deputy Secretary-General, UN Environment head in New York, UN-Women Deputy head in New York and Previous MOPAN head).

Literature review and previous evaluations

Several documents and reports were reviewed by the Panel for this assessment process, including background material that was generated specifically for the report, as well as previous evaluations and assessments.

Reports drawn on by the Panel include:

- MOPAN 2016 assessment report of UN-Habitat, which evaluated the organisation's systems, practices and behaviours, and results from 2014 to mid-2016, using MOPAN 3.0 Methodology in its analysis.
- Office of Internal and Oversight Services (OIOS) 2014 assessment report, assessing the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UN-Habitat, as it embarked on its strategic plan for the period 2014-2019.
- 2015 UN-Habitat report[a] detailing discussions on options for the strengthening of UN-Habitat and reforming its governance structure.

[a] UN-Habitat (2015). Review of the Governance Structure of United Nations Human Settlement Programme, HSP/GC/25/2/Add.1-Report of the Executive Director. United Nations Human Settlement Programme.

- 2017 report of the UN-Habitat Governing Council,[b] pointing to the continued strengthening of this Council's oversight role and that of the CPR over UN-Habitat work, and assuring implementation of the recommendations made so far.
- A recent mid-term evaluation of UN-Habitat[c] indicating the need for the agency to take a leading role in the NUA and SDG 11.
- DFID 2011 assessment report on how UN-Habitat's work aligns with United Kingdom development objectives and assessed the quality of the agency's performance, collecting evidence and scoring on two indices. (See annex IX on reviews of reports)

Guiding questions

The panel generated a set of guiding questions for Member States, the finance team of UN-Habitat and questions for relevant stakeholder and actors to generate evidence and information on the effectiveness of UN-Habitat. These questions were also developed into an online survey using Survey Planet online tool and the link was circulated to different networks including UN-agencies, urban experts, academic institutions, civil society organisations and Member States. Responses to the online questions were 44 in total. (See annex VI for analysis of result of questions)

The guiding questions were also circulated to the Panel members' respective constituencies including the following:

- Member States with permanent missions in New York and Nairobi
- UN agencies and all regional commissions
- ECLAC, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
- African Group of Ministers, a consortium of local leaders and the Local Government Constituency
- Urban experts and stakeholder groups including Slum/Shack Dwellers International among others.

The guiding questions were circulated to a list of 240 addresses for Member States and 42 agencies with 144 focal points of the UN Task Teams on Habitat III.

To publicise the assessment process, and to encourage stakeholders to share their perspectives with the Panel, the High-level Panel secretariat created a twitter hashtag **#HLPUNHabitat**. The survey link was tweeted by the Global Task Force and Minister Robles to encourage their constituencies to provide feedback.

A total of 124 responses were received to the guiding questions that were circulated. 107 of these responses were from Member States (inclusive of 54 African countries represented by the Africa Regional group and 28 European Countries represented by the EU) and 17 from other stakeholders and actors. The responses have been summarised and incorporated into the High-level Panel's report.

[b] UN-Habitat-Governing Council (2017). Addendum: Activities of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, Working Group on programme and budget — Report of the Executive Director.

[c] UN-Habitat (2017). Mid-Term Evaluation of the Implementation of UN-Habitat's Strategic Plan, 2014-2019. https://unhabitat.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/2017-05-01-Final-Report-UN-Habitat-Strategic-Plan-Mid-Term-Evaluation.pdf.

Following the first round of consultations, the Panel developed additional questions to generate more evidence for the assessment and received 69 responses from Member States. (See annexes IV and V)

Field trips

As part of the Panel's assessment mandate, the Panel visited two UN-Habitat project sites to gather evidence for the report.

- The Kiambu County's Semi-Aerobic landfill project, a benchmark waste management programme supported by UN-Habitat. It started as a pilot project and has now gained national support. The Panel met with the Deputy Mayor of Kiambu county, Minister of Finance and Economic planning of Kiambu and other local government representatives (water, environment, planning, land and housing sectors).
- The Mashimoni project in Mathare Slums where the Panel met with the Mashimoni Settlement Executive Committee and Pamoja Trust. This community gave a brief history of the project including the support and tools (example Global Land Tool Network to map the community and draw legal documents of land ownership) they have received from UN-Habitat.

Panel discussions and analysis of evidence

The Panel has had several meetings to deliberate on findings and recommendations. The Panel met twice in New York and twice in Nairobi. The Panel members also held a series of teleconferences to discuss and align on recommendations.

nex III

List of consultations

New York

- Habitat III secretariat
- Member States (Germany, China, Norway, Brazil, Japan, Russian Federation, Canada, Finland, Czechia, Nigeria, Philippines, Kenya, Croatia, Dominican Republic, France, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, Singapore, Maldives, State of Palestine, Islamic Republic of Iran, Portugal, United States of America, Mexico, South Africa, Republic of Korea, Lesotho, Malaysia, Peru, Jamaica, Ecuador, Afghanistan)
- United Nations task force (FAO, UNESCO, UNIDO, UNHCR, UNOPS, UN Volunteers, IFAD, UN Environment, UN-OSAA, ECA, UN-Women, UNISDR, UNICEF, ECLAC, UNDP, IOTT, UNCDF, ECSWA, ILO, UN-ESCAD, ECE, World Bank Group)
- UN Environment Head in New York
- UN-Women Deputy Head of programmes in New York
- Civil Society Working Group towards Habitat III
- Former Head of MOPAN secretariat, Bjorn Gillsater
- Urban Experts and Economists
  - Aromar Revi, Director, Indian Institute for Human Settlements (IIHS)
  - Michael Cohen, Director of International Affairs Program, The New School
  - William Cobbett, Director, Cities Alliance
  - Junaid Ahmed, Country Director for India, World Bank
  - David Satterthwaite, Senior Fellow, International Institute for Environment and Development
  - Edgar Pieterse, South African Research Chair in Urban Policy University of Cape Town

Nairobi

- UN-Habitat
  - The Executive Director
  - Senior management team
  - Budget and finance team
  - Programme and Branch Heads
- Member States
  - Governing Council of UN-Habitat
  - Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR)
  - Bureau of the Committee of Permanent Representatives and Governing Council (United Republic of Tanzania, Rwanda, Ghana, Colombia, Israel, Islamic Republic of Iran, United States, Germany)

- Working Group on Programme and Budget
- Regional Group of Africa
- Western European and Other States (WEOG)
- Eastern European States
- Asia-Pacific States
- Latin American and Caribbean States (GRULAC)
- Bilateral Member States meetings
    - President of the Governing Council to UN-Habitat
    - Japan
    - Brazil
    - United States
    - Afghanistan
    - Kenya
    - Cameroon
    - Germany

– United Nations Agencies

- Regional Directors of UNICEF, UN Environment and UNHCR
- United Nations Country Team (UN Resident Coordinator Nairobi, FAO, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNAIDS, UNSDR, UNHCR, UNODC)
- UN Environment governing body secretariat

– Civil Society Organisations

- Federations of Urban Poor
- General Assembly of Partners (GAP)
- World Urban Campaign (WUC)

Annex IV

Questions to assess and enhance the effectiveness of UN-Habitat

Guiding questions — also circulated formally by email

These questions were used during consultations with Member States and other stakeholders to UN-Habitat. They were also circulated formally by email to Member States and other stakeholders.

1. What is your assessment on the current state of UN-Habitat?

2. Is the mandate sufficient to address the New Urban Agenda?

    - Is the mandate still relevant or not?
    - Are the agency's strategic areas responsive enough to the New Urban Agenda?
    - How normative and/or operational should UN-Habitat's mandate be?

3. What is working well and what needs to be improved?

    - How should UN-Habitat governance and management be structured (to increase its effectiveness, accountability, transparent decision-making)? — for example, universal membership.

4. How does UN-Habitat work with other actors/stakeholders? (national, subnational and local governments; UN agencies; private sector and non-government organisations)

5. What is UN-Habitat's role within the UN system and what should it be?

6. Are the resources and financial capability of UN-Habitat sufficient enough to address the New Urban Agenda? What could be the way forward?

NB: A total of **124** responses came to these guiding questions came in via email of which **107** were from Member States (inclusive of 54 African countries represented by the Africa Regional group and 28 European Countries represented by the EU) and **17** from other stakeholders/actors

Additional questions for Member States.

To get better clarity on some issues, the Panel developed additional questions for Member States and these were used for Member State discussion in New York and circulated after the follow-up meeting in Nairobi.

1. How important is the urban agenda at the national level?

    a. Is UN-Habitat the only UN agency that can implement the New Urban Agenda?

    b. Does UN-Habitat have the capacity and funding to support urban ministries in national governments? And/or do other UN agencies have such capacity?

2. Please submit the key elements of normative work (e.g. policy guidance, standards and norms) that need to be expanded, to support the NUA?

3. What funding mechanisms can you suggest for this enhanced normative programme? If we are to stay with earmarked funding, what does that mean for transparency and accountability?

4. What are the limits of the current governance structure for a UN-Habitat fit to deliver the New Urban Agenda? And, what potential changes in governance would be appropriate? (e.g. universal membership, UN-Women model)

5. What specific forms and engagements for coordination and collaboration should be prioritised?

a. What agencies/entities should be prioritised for coordination and collaboration?

b. Which elements of the New Urban Agenda should be the responsibility of UN-Habitat?

NB: A total of **69** Member States (this includes the African Group representing all 54 countries) provided responses.

Online questions through Survey Planet

1. Please list your government affiliation and/or institutional affiliation

2. Please give us your name and title/position within your institutional affiliation

3. What is the government or institution assessment on the current state of UN-Habitat?

4. Is the mandate sufficient to address the New Urban Agenda?

5. Is the mandate still relevant or not?

6. Are the agency's strategic areas responsive enough to the New Urban Agenda?

7. How normative and/or operational should UN-Habitat's mandate be?

8. What is working well and what needs to be improved?

9. How should UN-Habitat governance and management be structured (to increase its effectiveness, accountability, transparent decision-making)?

10. How does UN-Habitat work with other actors/stakeholders? (national, subnational and local governments; UN agencies; and non-government organisations)

11. What is UN-Habitat's role within the UN system, and what should it be?

12. Are the resources and financial capability of UN-Habitat sufficient enough to address the New Urban Agenda? What could be the way forward?

NB: A total of **50** responses generated of which **42** were complete responses, **6** left blank and **1** filled in half way.

Annex V

Summary of responses from Member States, United Nations agencies and stakeholders

General assessment of UN-Habitat

For most **Member States** consulted, the general appraisal is mostly negative and indications that there is a need for reform were abundant. Problems highlighted had to do with the relationship of UN-Habitat with Member States and UN entities, with management and leadership, capacity to implement the NUA and the insufficiency of UN-Habitat's resources. On the positive side, Member States indicated the important and valuable work and the quality and importance of the dialogue among diverse stakeholders that UN-Habitat stimulated and the positive indications provided by the ongoing reform. The **responses received online** indicated very clearly the perception that UN-Habitat's status is not good. Inputs received from **other stakeholders** indicate some positive aspects: being an important expert body with valuable normative work and good networks with city administrations. However, UN-Habitat is generally considered weak, under-resourced, peripheral, poorly led, with a dispersed focus. Some consider that little progress has been made to improve over the years. In relation to the implementation of the SDGs and the NUA, the perceptions are that its role is still undefined, that it is underprepared and underresourced, not fit-for-purpose. Relationships with Member States, other UN agencies and global urban networks are perceived to have deteriorated. UN-Habitat is seen as poorly connected with other agencies, with a lot of overlap and an ambiguous/awkward fit with the UN's wider institutional architecture.

Importance of the New Urban Agenda

Generally, the New Urban Agenda is considered very important and in some cases more important than ever. It will contribute to facilitate connectivity between big cities and surrounding areas, including rural areas and in some contexts, for instance for the African countries, the process of urbanisation, and the potential embedded within it, presents an invaluable opportunity to realise the economic, social and spatial structural transformations needed. While the New Urban Agenda is an international agreement, it is intended mainly to guide national and sub-national activities. In some countries, the development of a national programme for sustainable urban development has been inspired by the New Urban Agenda. There should be further incentive by both UN-Habitat and the local governments to define action plans for the implementation of the New Urban Agenda.

What is working well and not working well for UN-Habitat

For Member States, the quality and competency of UN-Habitat and its staff are valuable and its role in the recognition of the urban challenges and the technical and normative tools developed make it an important organisation for Member States. However, management problems, problems of coordination within the UN, excessive operational work, the quality of relations with Member States, the insufficient relation with national governments, funding problems and its location in Nairobi constitute the main difficulties and bottlenecks currently. The responses received online highlight that on the positive side UN-Habitat has competence in its work and has established varied and ample partnerships. What needs to be improved is communication, it needs increased resources to perform, activities should be narrowed and focus improved. In addition, respondents consider that UN-Habitat needs to have a clearer role, fine-tune partnerships, more efficiency, and work to be responsive to the NUA and support other entities in this sense.

UN-Habitat mandate

The majority of **Member States** consider that UN-Habitat's mandate is sufficient to address the NUA and that it is relevant. Opinions are divided, however, with regard to the responsiveness of UN-Habitat's strategic areas to the NUA. The majority of the **responses received online** indicate that the mandate is sufficient to address the NUA and that it is still relevant. Opinions are also divided regarding UN-Habitat's strategic areas and the NUA. **Other stakeholders** consider that the unique expertise and knowledge of UN-Habitat in sustainable urbanisation must be underlined, fortified and adapted and that it does not cover all areas of the NUA. The traditional housing and land mandate of UN-Habitat could and should be refreshed. The mandate is considered still relevant but needs to be broadened.

The core work of UN-Habitat

Member States expressed that as a programme, UN-Habitat's mandate was expanded to cover operational activities and now needs to strengthen its normative capacity. It needs to work on planning, policy and project management to assist countries in defining an action plan to support the NUA. UN-Habitat's core work is to provide and disseminate policy recommendations on national land and urban policies and globally share lessons learned from project implementation. The organisation needs to continue to be the knowledge repository, a trusted reference on urban development and human settlements and 'go-to' place for information in its field. It also should guide urbanisation, assist and design innovative approaches, to disseminate best practices, provide technical assistance and empower countries to translate policies into practise.

UN-Habitat normative and operational work

Most Member States consider UN-Habitat should have a mandate that is both normative and operational but a large number of the respondents thinks that it should be more normative, in particular European countries. The responses received online also point to a mandate that should be both normative and operational. For other stakeholders consulted, UN-Habitat also needs to aim for a more balanced and recalibrated combination of normative and operational, with stronger links between normative and operational activities. Project implementation should be targeted and feed into the normative work.

Key elements of normative work that need to be expanded to support the New Urban Agenda

For Member States, the key elements of normative work are capacity building, knowledge incubation, generation and development, developing implementation frameworks, devising implementation and evaluation tools, promoting and championing best practices, producing data and trend analysis, research, publications, producing country, regional and global reports, guidelines, toolkits, and documenting project lessons and findings, providing policy guidance, advocacy, standards, norms and codes of best practice. UN-Habitat needs to be transparent and to involve technical experts from governments to ensure sufficient country ownership.

UN-Habitat Governance structure and management

To Member States, the governance models suggested include the Hybrid Governance Model, and the smaller and operational Executive Board type as employed by UNDP, UNFPA, UN-Women and UNICEF, converting UN-Habitat into a specialised UN-agency. As for participation, opinions are oriented towards

enhancing participation of stakeholders in the work of the governing body, having a Governing Council with all Member States of the UN, and the Working Group on Programme and Budget that could be elevated to an additional inter-sessional body. In general, visibility at UN-Headquarters in New York should be improved and at the same time there is a need to consolidate headquarter functions in Nairobi, all this done through a clear definition of Headquarter's functions. Converting the regular budget allocation for UN-Habitat into a grant should be explored. The **responses received online** indicate that UN-Habitat needs to have more visibility, accountability, political support, and financial autonomy. For the respondents, it needs to define clear core functions, a strategy (and an inter-agency strategy), review partnerships to include more varied partners in its work. For **other stakeholders consulted**, there is a clear need to change the governance structures. Most indications are that an Executive/Management Board should be established, removed from the UN Secretariat and established as an autonomous body. The majority also sees this as the way forward with a multi-level governance structure (or tripartite), with a broader inclusion of key stakeholders, sub-national governments, regional UN bodies, with a possible constitution of other mechanisms such as an external advisory group or a coordination mechanism of different agencies, or even a coordinating structure to be established that is not located in UN-Habitat. The NY office of UN-Habitat should also be significantly strengthened.

Universal membership

Opinions are divided among **Member States** regarding universal membership. While the African countries indicate the need to call for universal membership, developed world countries indicate either no universal membership or another modality that does not necessarily require funding from UN member states. Only a very small number of the **responses received online** indicated the need for universal membership. Among the **other stakeholders** consulted, there are references to the need for a more strategic universal membership but most of the indications were towards multiple sources of income through varied partnerships.

UN-Habitat's work with other actors (Partnership)

Opinions of **Member States** are also divided about the relations of UN-Habitat with other actors, namely with national governments. In general, relations with sub-national and local governments are considered good, while with UN agencies and NGOs they may not be good in the opinion of some Member States. **Responses received online** are divided on this front. **Other stakeholders** indicated that UN-Habitat has excellent cooperation, very good relationships and connections at the local level with government counterparts, networks to raise awareness among mayors and local government officials about the urban issues and has been working imaginatively with partners. However, it needs to improve and coordinate efforts of other UN agencies, work more with Member States, cooperate with existing intergovernmental bodies and establish strategic cooperation with UN regional commissions. More specifically, it needs to strengthen the role of the World Urban Forum, making it an appropriate stakeholder platform.

Forums and engagement within and outside the UN system for the delivery of the NUA

Most Member States from inputs received think UN-Habitat should make efforts to bring in new donors by actively informing them of the importance of its normative programmes. The organisation must retain its role as a focal point in the New Urban Agenda and should engage municipalities better and host ministries in national

frameworks. UNDAF is one such platform. Country level interventions should be coordinated by UN-Habitat.

UN-Habitat's role in the United Nations

For **Member States**, UN-Habitat has a specific role in the area of urbanisation and in the achievement of SDGs and the NUA. However, this should be stronger, more involved with other commissions, regional and national agendas. Its role should be focused on guidance, support and knowledge and information within the UN system for the implementation of the NUA, establishing stronger partnerships and assuring coordination. The **responses received online** indicate that UN-Habitat's role should be more normative, its urban advocate role should be enhanced and it should be the convener of UN urban policy, a leader with a key role in urban issues. **Other stakeholders** referred to the leading role of UN-Habitat in the coordination of partners on urban issues, its role as the placeholder UN agency for urban issues, and in advocacy, policy and knowledge for the delivery of the NUA. In general, they consider that UN-Habitat should be a convener, assuring coordination and cooperation with other UN agencies but not necessarily be the overarching voice for urban, as it is the role of the UN system to implement the NUA.

Is UN-Habitat the only entity that can implement the New Urban Agenda?

The perception of some Member States is that UN-Habitat is not the only UN agency to implement the NUA. For some, it has the mandate and expertise to implement a great majority of areas in the New Urban Agenda and so should play and continue to play the role of focal point for issues related to sustainable cities and human settlements. Some think the organisation is equipped to provide strong leadership and should provide support for and coordinate of the implementation of NUA. However, tertiary institutions and research centres, local organisations and governments should be encouraged to participate in the implementation process.

UN-Habitat resources and financing in relation to NUA

Member States consider that for the implementation of the NUA, UN-Habitat will need more resources, that the current finances are insufficient. The African Member States generally agree on increased Regular Budget contributions. Other indications are for increased innovative programmes, strategies, and partnerships to diversify the sources of funding. However, there has to be a change prior to devising a strategy to increase funding: resolving structural and trust problems, assessing the funding needs for the NUA. The majority of the **responses received online** also indicate that resources and financial capacity are not enough. The way forward could be planning for long-term budgets, increase member-state contributions and a commitment of the countries that signed the NUA. Diversification and leveraging of resources would imply alliances with other agencies and UNDAF budget, and include the private sector and non-government, the BRIC countries, cities and municipalities. **To other stakeholders**, UN-Habitat does not have sufficient resources and will need to leverage the ones already available — including its staff — by establishing synergies with other UN organisations, working together with them, namely with shared staff, time and financial resources. On the other hand, it should enlarge its core budget and normative work. Most of the indications were, however, that it should expand the possibilities by, on one hand, calling for all Member States' full contributions, combined with voluntary contributions and, on the other, engaging private sector partners and possibilities like multi-lateral platforms (e.g. Cities Alliance, Global Fund for Basic Services, Global Observatory on Local Finance, Climate Financing), Development Banks.

Funding mechanisms to enhance the normative work of UN-Habitat

For some Member States, UN-Habitat should manage and operate within the scope of its present resources and financial capacity but also aim at increasing core funding and country earmarked funding. It needs increased and predictable core funding from the UN regular budget but should also make efforts to bring in new donors by actively informing them of the importance and value of its normative programmes. Core resources from the UN need to be combined with technical cooperation funds. The organisation should also be funded from the non-earmarked general-purpose contributions, which should increase with more trust, and funding could also increase through cross agency collaboration.

UN-Habitat's capacity and funding to support urban ministries

UN-Habitat is facing several challenges and does not have the capacity to address them. However, it still possesses the capacity to support the relevant governmental bodies of developing countries in charge of urbanisation. It is difficult to see other agencies fulfilling UN-Habitat's role. Should the funding return to normal, it will have the expected capacity. Habitat Programme Managers (HPM) at country level should be revitalised and at the same time, there should be a focus on emerging countries and under-developed regions. Other agencies do not have the capacity to support urban ministries.

Annex VI

Result of online questions and analysis

Number of online responses considered: 44 (42 complete and 2 incomplete)






Is mandate still relevant
Number of responses
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
Don't know
Not relevant
Still relevant
Response options


Is mandate sufficient to address the New Urban Agenda
Number of responses
25
20
15
10
5
0
Don't know
No
Yes
Response options


Mandate should be normative and / or operational
Response options
Very normative
More operational
More normative
Don't know
Both
0
5
10
15
20
Number of responses



What is working well and what needs to be improved?

What is working well is that UN-Habitat has competence in its work, has established varied and ample partnerships, participates in numerous relevant forums and works with local and national governments. It addresses the global south. Communication and networking are working well.

What needs to be improved is communication; increased resources to perform; activities are too expanded, there is a need to focus; need to have a clearer role; need to fine-tune partnerships; more efficiency; needs to develop areas needed for the NUA; needs engagement and advance knowledge passed; monitoring of NUA; link up with population health and health equity; more national urban policies and governance frameworks that make cities respond to NUA.

How should UN-Habitat governance and management be structured (to increase its effectiveness, accountability, transparent decision-making)? Should there be Universal membership?

The consensus is it needs more visibility; more accountability; political support; and, financial autonomy. It needs to define clear core functions; to define a strategy (and an inter-agency strategy); to review partnerships; to include representatives of organised groups, such as churches, mosques leaders, social movements; more participation of SCO in UN-Habitat management; to establish a Centre for Cities to do research and test aspects of NUA. 2% indicated Yes to universal membership.



What is UN-Habitat's role within the UN system and what should it be?

UN-Habitat is a specialised organisation with high expertise; it is the advocate of urban development; it is small for this role. Its role should be more normative; its urban advocate role should be enhanced; it should be the convener of UN urban policy; should be a leader in urban issues; should have a key role on urban issues; should collaborate with UNEA; should have a more important role in the UN system; should support government services and cities.



Way forward

There is a need for long-term budgets, increased member-state contributions, leveraged resources, alliances with other agencies and UNDAF budget; partnerships including private and non-government; from BRIC countries; need for financial commitments between the countries that signed the NUA; more 'buy-in' from cities and municipalities; demonstrated results to stimulate more resources.

Annex VII

Urban work in the United Nations

Urban data

- UNFPA (urban demographics, urban youth work)
- UNICEF (MICS)
- WHO (world database on cities air pollution)

Projects with UN-Habitat

- UNFPA (sexual and reproductive health in urban slums; young people capacities and urbanisation; urban gender equality)
- UNICEF (many urban work programmes, especially in WASH; and support for the Child Friendly Cities Initiative)
- WB (Global Platform for Sustainable Cities, City Creditworthiness Initiative)
- ICAO (airports and urban development)
- UN-Women (Safe Cities and Safe Public Spaces)
- UNOPS Cities Alliance, Cities without slums — Secretariat (UN Environment, UN-Habitat, UNCDF, UNDP, UNISDR, UNHCR)

Work about urban

- United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) (Habitat III Discussions on Urban Legislation and Municipal Finance)
- UNU (several courses and training)
- UNICEF (work towards an urban strategy 2017)
- UNDP (new Sustainable Urbanisation Strategy, Articulation of Territorial Networks)
- UNITAR, UN-Women (World Alliance of Cities Against Poverty)
- UNAIDS (Alliance of Mayors and Municipal Leaders on HIV-Aids)
- UNDESA (publications on inclusive cities, urban youth, local authority engagement)
- UNESCO (sociocultural urban frameworks, urban culture and heritage, Creative Cities Network, Growing Up in Cities, Global Network of Learning Cities)
- WHO (Healthy Cities Programme, Global Network for Age-Friendly Cities and Communities)
- UNFCCC (light touch interaction with cities/subnational coalitions of actors)
- UN Environment (Partnership for Clean Fuels and Vehicles (PCFV), Climate and Clean Air Coalition, Initiative on Road Design and Finance for Safety, Sustainability, and Accessibility, Sustainable Buildings and Climate Initiative (SBCI), Sustainable Social Housing Initiative (SUSHI), Sustainable Buildings Policies in Developing Countries (SPoD), UN Environment's Division of Early Warning and Assessment (DEWA), UN Environment International Environmental Technology Centre (IETC) — solid waste management systems, Awareness and Preparedness for Emergencies on a Local Level

Programme (APELL), CBD: urban ecosystem management, Cities and Biodiversity Outlook project (CBO)

- FAO (D groups Global Network: "Food for Cities, Programme for Urban and Peri-urban Horticulture, Urban Agriculture Programme, Urban and peri-urban forestry Programme, City region food systems (CRFS) network)

UN-Habitat projects and programmes:

- Urban Youth Fund
- Urban low emission development strategies (Urban-LEDS)
- Urban Planning and Design Lab, Safer Cities Programme (UNCJIN, UNODC, UNICRI, UNODCCP)
- Global Network on Safer Cities (GNSC)
- Participatory Slum Upgrading Programme (PSUP)
- Greener Cities Partnership (UN Environment)
- City Resilience Profiling Programme (CRPP)
- Cities and Climate Change Initiative (UN Environment, World Bank, Cities Alliance)
- Africa Urban Agenda Programme
- Global Urban Observatory (GUO)
- Global Network for Sustainable Housing (GNSH) (ILO, UNECE)
- Global Land Tool Network (GLTN)
- Habitat UNI
- Cities and Climate Change Academy
- Urban Legal Network (ULN)
- Global Network of Urban Planning and Design Labs
- World Urban Campaign

Urban efforts without specific projects:

- IOM (management of migration and refugees in urban settings)
- OHCHR (promotion of inclusive cities and protection of human rights in informal settlements)
- OSRSGVAC (strengthening the role of mayors for child protection)
- UNHCR (management of refugee camps in urban areas)
- UNICRI (safer cities and urban resilience)
- UNISDR (urban ecology, urban resilience, Making Cities Resilient campaign)
- UNODA (safer cities and arms control)
- UNODC (safer cities and drugs control)
- ILO (urban economies, urban youth and housing policies)
- ITU (smart cities and engagement with tech sector, ITU-T, Smart Sustainable Cities Programme, ITU-T Study Group 20 (SG20) — Internet of Things and

Smart Cities, United for Smart Sustainable Cities (U4SSC), ITU-T, Environment, Climate Change and Circular Economy)

- World Tourism Organisation (UN WTO) (sustainable tourism knowledge management)
- IFAD (City Region Food System (CRFS) network)
- WFP (urban food security knowledge dissemination and urban safety nets)

Urban financing:

- UNCDF (municipal finance knowledge)
- UNIDO (industrial revitalisation, Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development for urban sustainability)
- WB (municipal finance, Urban Development Programme)

Annex VIII

Partnerships of United Nations entities

UN entity	*Partnerships*
Funds and programmes	Bilateral Participation in specialised networks Inter-agency mechanisms Specific mechanisms
UNDP (incl. UNCDF, UNV)	Governments United Nations System International financial institutions Private sector Foundations Civil society organisations
UN-Women	Government contributors National mechanisms Civil society Businesses and foundations National Committees Goodwill Ambassadors Media collaboration
UNFPA	Engaged in collaborations with stakeholders including the business sector, foundations, parliamentarians, civil society, academia and scientific institutions, as well as individuals and multi-stakeholder initiatives.
UNICEF	Public partnerships, especially with local governments Corporate partnerships Civil society partnerships European Union A Promise Renewed Global Education First Initiative UNGEI
WFP	Collaborative work with thousands of partners, including governments, private sector, UN agencies, international finance groups, academia, NGOs and other civil society groups.
UNHCR	UNHCR collaborates with governments, intergovernmental, non-governmental organisations, UN agencies, community-based organisations, universities, the judiciary and the private sector.
UNAIDS	Partnerships with the private sector: programmatic partnerships, advocacy, fundraising support, or contributions-in-kind.
UNCTAD (incl. ITC)	UN System and other international organisations, governments, businesses, civil society, youth and academia. Geneva-based Trade Institutions: WTO and ITC

UN entity	*Partnerships*
	A total of 111 intergovernmental bodies and 222 civil society organisations.
UN-Environment	Specific stakeholders such as foundations, non-state actors, forums as well as major private companies in global intergovernmental meetings such as the UN Environment Assembly. Coordination in UN Environment for participation of existing private sector partners in the Assembly. Promotes the private sector's participation in the implementation of UN Environment Assembly resolutions and their links to the Sustainable Development Goals.
UN-Habitat	Habitat Agenda Partners (HAP) includes a range of organisations outside central government: Local authorities NGOs and CBOs Trade unions Professionals Academics and researchers Human solidarity groups Indigenous people Parliamentarians Private sector Foundations Financial institutions Youth Women
UNODC	National, regional and international organisations UN System NGOs/civil society Private sector European Union
UNRWA	UN agencies share skills and expertise; partners with businesses and foundations, small community-based organisations, international NGOs, private individuals.
Specialised agencies	Bilateral Participation in specialised networks Inter-agency mechanisms Specific mechanisms
FAO	Academia and research institutions Civil society Cooperatives Private sector Resource partners South-South cooperation Parliamentary alliances

UN entity	*Partnerships*
IAEA	Member States, United Nations agencies, research organisations and civil society. Collaborating centres United Nations system European Union Other international organisations Regional/cooperative agreements
UNESCO	Non-governmental organisations, intergovernmental organisations, private sector, media, international networks Partnering with UNESCO, Goodwill Ambassadors.
ICAO	All United Nations agencies and foundations; corporations, foundations, and individuals; civil aviation authorities, the private sector and civil society.
ILO	Tripartism and the design and implementation of development cooperation programmes and projects with the active participation of governments, employers and workers. Donor community, the multilateral system, social partners, civil society, the private sector, South-South and triangular cooperation programmes, and other development actors Public-private partnerships
IMO	Global Partnership on Marine Litter (GPML) UN Environment, Governments, Businesses, Academia, Local Authorities, Nongovernmental Organisations and Intergovernmental Organisations. United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment, International Maritime Organisation (IMO), Food and Agriculture Organisation of the UN (FAO) IHO Hydrography Capacity Building Programme for Coastal States International Hydrographic Organisation (IGO); 87 IHO Member States (Governments); International Maritime Organisation (UN); World Meteorological Organisation (UN); International Association of Marine Aids to Navigation and Lighthouse Authorities (NGO)
ITU	Global Partnership on Waste Management (GPWM) UN Environment International Solid Waste Association (ISWA) International Telecommunication Union (ITU) The Basel Convention Regional Centre for Asia and the Pacific (BCRC China) ICTs for Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation for SIDS ITU with possible partners to be confirmed including WMO, UNISDR, UN Environment, UNDP and existing partnerships including The Nairobi Work Programme; in which ITU is a member of, LoCAL funded by UNCDF, a partner of ITU; Caribbean Risk Management (CRM) among others. ITUT/UNESCO Broadband Commission for Sustainable Development ITU, UNESCO

UN entity	*Partnerships*
UNIDO	Multi-stakeholder dialogue, private sector is a strategic partner. Cooperation with BRICS Partnerships with international development organisations Partnerships with the private sector South-South cooperation Networks, centres, forums and platforms UNIDO and the Global Environment Facility (GEF)
UPU	UN Organisations: UNDP, UN Environment, ITU, ICAO, ILO, WTO. Non-UN Organisations: International Air Transport Association (IATA), the International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO), the International Organisation for Migration and the World Customs Organisation (WCO).
WIPO	Publisher partners American Association for the Advancement of Science American Institute of Physics Cambridge University Press Canadian Science Publishing Elsevier Institute of Physics John Wiley & Sons Nature Publishing Group Oxford University Press National Academy of Sciences National Institute of Science Communication and Information Resources (NISCAIR) Royal Society of Chemistry Sage Publications Scientific and Academic Publishing Springer Science + Business Media Taylor & Francis The Company of Biologists Programme partners Food & Agriculture Organisation International Association of Scientific, Technical & Medical Publishers United Nations Environment Programme World Health Organisation
WHO	WHO departments across the organisation — implementation of the workplan for climate change and health United Nations organisations WHO Collaborating Centres for Climate Change and Health Donors

UN entity	*Partnerships*
	Government agencies NGOs Universities and academic centres
WMO	WMO works in partnership with international agencies, other organisations, academia, the media and the private sector to improve the range and quality of critical environmental information and services. Agreements with the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency; working arrangements with specialised agencies of the United Nations; agreements with intergovernmental organisations; working arrangements with intergovernmental organisations and non-governmental international organisations; consultative status for non-governmental international organisations; Memorandums of Understanding (MoU).
UNWTO	UNWTO's membership includes 157 countries, 6 Associate Members and 500 Affiliate Members representing the private sector, educational institutions, tourism associations and local tourism authorities.

Annex IX

Recommendations from previous assessments of UN-Habitat

MOPAN (2017). MOPAN 2015-16 Assessments; United Nations Human Settlement Programme - Institutional Assessment Report.

Methodology & what was being assessed

Assessing UN-Habitat's organisational systems, practices and behaviours, and results in the period from 2014 to mid-2016 applying the MOPAN 3.0 methodology.

Findings

UN-Habitat largely meets the requirements of an effective multilateral organisation, is fit for purpose, but performance can be strengthened and improved in some areas.

The main conclusions related to the HLP assessment are:

- UN-Habitat has made considerable investments to reform the organisation: the new decentralised matrix management
- Approach is working effectively to achieve integrated results across programmes and normative work
- Its technical work adds value and its participatory project design ensures relevance; its partners value its support and have high levels of confidence in it
- Its powerful new partnerships with city, regional and national governments, as well as traditional and new development partners, have the potential to be transformative
- Has embraced results-based management at all levels, improving accountability for results
- Positive results achieved across all areas of operation.

Recommendations

- Stabilise core funding, and increase the proportion and volume of flexible core funding
- A new partnership strategy, linked to the inter-agency framework and the current resource mobilisation strategy
- Expedite institutional reforms, specifically the roll out of the Umoja management system
- Deepen mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues: strengthen processes for embedding climate change and human rights approaches and knowledge into programme and project design, implementation and oversight
- Engage in more comprehensive consultation with beneficiaries
- Strengthen reporting at the outcome level; apply a more systematic approach to establishing targets and data collection
- Develop comprehensive results analysis tools, more systematic approaches to knowledge management, and better processes to track partnerships and accountability across the organisation
- Incorporate learning from evaluations through a stronger feedback mechanism to improve organisational performance

- Focus more on sustainability in interventions and on identifying and managing risks throughout the programme delivery process.

OIOS — Office for Internal Oversight Services (2015). Evaluation of the United Nations Human Settlement Programme, E/AC.51/2015/2, United Nations Economic and Social Council.
http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=E/AC.51/2015/2.

Methodology & what was being assessed

Assessment of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), and the extent to which UN-Habitat has in place the elements to plan for, manage towards and demonstrate results as it embarks on its strategic plan for the period 2014-2019.

Findings

- UN-Habitat positioned itself as the lead United Nations agency responsible for an area of growing global priority: sustainable urbanisation.
- This priority has not yet cascaded throughout the agency, however. In some countries, its work lacks a sustainable urbanisation focus altogether.
- UN-Habitat has been effective in delivering its targeted outputs, although credible evidence of accomplishment is more readily available for its global initiatives than for its country operations.
- UN-Habitat does not yet have adequate systems in place to credibly demonstrate whether its targeted results will have been achieved in 2014-2019, even for its largest, highest-priority, and highest-risk areas of work.
- Despite well-documented external constraints, UN-Habitat made measurable improvements in its approach to defining and managing towards its targeted results during the period evaluated. These include greater structural alignment to its corporate results targets, mechanisms for improving the quality of its project proposals, the roll-out of an integrated online project management tool, key policies to help steer itself towards the results targeted in 2014-2019 and improved gender mainstreaming.
- Absence of several key elements could thwart the future success of UN-Habitat. These include the lack of a risk management mechanism and accountability framework, weaknesses in information and knowledge management and a lack of clear final strategies in a number of key areas, such as resource mobilisation and partnerships.

Recommendations

- Needs to further strengthen the management, particularly in project approval, monitoring, reporting and accountability.

The Office has made 11 recommendations in these areas, namely on procedures and mechanisms, and UN-Habitat has accepted these recommendations and initiated action to implement them:

- Develop a risk management policy and plan of action
- Finalise an accountability framework
- Require the completion of regional strategic plans in all four regional offices and Habitat Country Programme Documents in priority country programmes

- Revise the quality assurance responsibilities entrusted to the Project Advisory Group
- Ensure that the agency's highest-risk initiatives are identified for evaluation, and locate sufficient funds for these evaluations
- Establish a system to organise, store and share information and knowledge
- Conclude the resource mobilisation strategy action plan and the partnership strategy.

UN-Habitat (2017) Governing Council of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme — Activities of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, Addendum: Working group on programme and budget: Report of the Executive Director

Methodology & what was being assessed

The Working Group on Programme of Work and Budget (2017), established by the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) has formulated since its constitution in 2015 several actionable sets of recommendations to the Executive Director.

Findings

Recommendations have been focused on:

- The need to strengthen communications and external relations
- Improve the gender balance
- Revising its business model
- Written updates on all the subprograms of UN-Habitat

Recommendations

The mandate of this Working Group has been extended due to the need to continue strengthening the oversight role of the Governing Council and the Committee over UN-Habitat work and assure implementation of the recommendations made so far.

DFID (2011) Multilateral Aid Review: Assessment of United Nations Human Settlements Programme, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67594/UN-human-settlements-prog.pdf.

Methodology & what was being assessed

The evaluation assessed its objective of leading to a real improvement in performance on the ground, to stimulate agencies to improve their value for money, transparency and put in place robust management systems. They have conducted a detailed assessment of how the multilateral system performs by examining every agency which receives more than £1 million of annual core funding from DFID, asked how their work aligns with UK development and humanitarian objectives, and assessed the quality of their organisational performance. They conducted detailed agency assessments, collecting evidence and scoring each multilateral partner on two indices.

Findings

Among the many findings and results of the assessment, the most relevant to the HLP are:

- Many of the issues it works on are covered by other agencies (e.g. UNDP, UNICEF)
- While addressing important issues it is relatively small scale and overlaps with other MOs
- UN-HABITAT operational role has a strong focus on the environment and tackling climate change. But no evidence could be found on its safeguards policy or that it is making a significant impact on the ground
- It spends significant resources in middle income countries (including upper middle income countries)
- Reports have highlighted the challenges UN-HABITAT has in scaling-up pilot projects
- UN-HABITAT's strategic plan is relatively weak. It remains resistant to embedding results-based management and evaluation
- Institutional performance has been a major concern of donors and is judged to be weak overall
- No evidence was found that savings are recycled into better performing parts of the organisation, that UN-HABITAT is able to make predictable long term financial commitments or that it releases aid flows according to schedule
- UN-HABITAT's financial oversight system is adequate but other aspects of financial management are weaker
- No evidence was found that UN-HABITAT is controlling administrative costs or focusing on its comparative advantage. On the contrary, some new priorities have been adopted
- No evidence was found that senior management has established objectives for cost effectiveness or VFM
- UN-HABITAT has developed good partnerships and networks
- UN-HABITAT does not operate under a presumption of disclosure
- It provides some information on projects to the governing body but does not publish full details on project performance
- UN-HABITAT is weak on transparency but stronger on accountability to partner governments
- Large parts of the senior management team have been resistant to change in the past. It will require ambitious reform for UN-HABITAT to become a highly performing organisation making a critical contribution to the MDGs
- While some reform efforts are underway the organisation's track record on improvement is not strong.

Recommendations

In March 2011 the Department for International Development's (DFID), the UK governments ceased all funding for UN-Habitat.

UN-Habitat (2015). Review of the Governance Structure of United Nations Human Settlement Programme, HSP/GC/25/2/Add.1-Report of the Executive Director. United Nations Human Settlement Programme,

Methodology & what was being assessed

The Executive Director of UN-Habitat submitted a report on the review of the governance structure to the Governing Council at its twenty-fourth session in 2015. Under the auspices of the President of the Governing Council and facilitated by the Chair of the Open-ended Consultative Group in consultation with the secretariat, members of the Council were subsequently engaged in informal discussions, through a contact group, on options for the strengthening of UN-Habitat and the reform of the governance structure.

Findings

Despite the discussions on options for the strengthening of UN-Habitat and the reform of the governance structure, opposing views held by members of the Governing Council on the matter led to no consensus and, as a result, the governance structure has remained unchanged. Some donors signalled that they would link their level of engagement with UN-Habitat with the governance issue, and cuts in financial contribution to UN-habitat by some donors is linked to the issue.

Recommendations

The Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, in consultation with the Executive Director, resumed informal discussions on governance reform in 2014.

***UN Habitat (2017) Mid Term Evaluation of the Implementation of UN-Habitat's Strategic Plan, 2014-2019,* https://unhabitat.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/2017-05-01-Final-Report-UN-Habitat-Strategic-Plan-Mid-Term-Evaluation.pdf**

Methodology & what was being assessed

This evaluation assessed progress achieved in implementing the Strategic Plan, determine whether UN-Habitat is achieving transformational results, and make recommendations about improvements that will strengthen performance. The evaluation included a broad document review, interviews with staff and stakeholders, and two surveys — one among CPR members, another among Implementing Partners.

Findings

- Generally, points to positive progress in the achievement of results
- A continued relevance, effectiveness and impact of the strategic plan
- And good evidence of transformational changes resulting from UN-Habitat's work, namely with national and local stakeholders
- Concerns with information and results reporting — with implications for affirmation of its leading role
- Concerns with progress towards Delivering as One;
- Slow and unwieldy governance structure;
- Internal inefficiencies.

Recommendations

- Gear up to take a strategic, leading role in the NUA and SDG 11
- Enable programmatic integration towards transformative results
- Advocate for 'fit-for-purpose' UN structure and systems
- Improve internal effectiveness and efficiency

European Commission Directorate General Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO) Pillar Assessment of the United Nations Human Settlement Programme (UN-Habitat), Final report, June 2016.

- Pillar 1: Internal control system — the entity has set up and ensued the functioning in all material respects of an effective and efficient internal control system and in accordance to the criteria set by the European Commission.
- Pillar 2: Accounting system — the entity uses an accounting system that provides in all material respects accurate, complete and reliable information in a timely manner and in accordance to the criteria set by the European Commission.
- Pillar 3: Independent external audit — the entity is subject to an independent external audit
- Pillar 4: Grants — the entity applies appropriate rules and procedures.
- Pillar 5: Procurement — the entity applies appropriate rules and procedures.
- Pillar 6: Financial instruments — not applicable.
- Pillar 7: Sub-delegation — the entity applies appropriate rules and procedures.

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 67/226 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system: funding analysis, Report of the Secretary-General, 28 December 2016 (A/72/61–E/2017/4)

Secretary-General's recommendation, contained in his report on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system: recommendations (A/71/292/Rev.1) was to attribute an incremental cost to all strictly earmarked contributions.

Recent reports of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the quadrennial comprehensive policy review and on the funding of operational activities for development, however, have included a detailed review and analysis of non-core funding and cost recovery (see A/71/63-E/2016/8, A/68/97-E/2013/87 and A/67/94-E/2012/80) and concluded that core resources are being used to subsidise non-core activities, thereby reducing the share of core funds available for actual programme activities.

Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation and the United Nations Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTFO) (2016) Financing the United Nations Development System: Current Trends and New Directions

Although the 2012 QCPR resolution encourages Member States making non-core contributions to give priority to pooled, thematic and joint funding mechanisms, the implementation of this point in the resolution remains weak. The percentage of pooled funds in the non-core development portfolio was significantly lower and ranged between a low of 3.6% in 2010 to a high of 9.6% in 2009 at the height of the

MDG Achievement Fund period. Both percentages fall well short of the QCPR indicator agreed in 2012 of 20% of non-core going through pooled funds as a means of strengthening UN coherence. [The resolution does not mention a percentage. However, the QCPR Monitoring and Reporting Framework refers the "% of top ten donors of funds and programmes with core contributions changing **by** 20 per cent or more from the previous year" as an indicator for the goal *Enhancing the overall funding, in particular core resources*]

***Towards enhancing core (unrestricted) funding to the UN Development system in the post-2015 period: a report prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs for the 2016 Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review*, https://www.un.org/ecosoc/sites/www.un.org.ecosoc/files/files/en/qcpr/qcpr-2016-desk-review-core-funding-paper.pdf.**

No mention to percentages to be allocated to core or earmarked, although indicating that there is an urgent need to explore ways that could enhance core funding to the UNDS including in broadening the contributor (donor) base.

Annex X

Bibliography

Archer, Diane and David Dodman (2017). Editorial: The urbanization of humanitarian crises, *Environment and Urbanization* 29 (2) in press

Beukes, Anni (2015) Making the invisible visible: generating data on 'slums' at local, city and global scales, *Human Settlements Working Paper*, IIED, http://pubs.iied.org/10757IIED/

Brown, Donald et al (2015) *Urban Crises and Humanitarian Responses: A Literature Review*, Development Planning Unit, University College London

Chen, Martha, Sally Roever and Caroline Skinner (2016) Informal livelihoods and cities: reframing theory and policy, *Environment and Urbanization* 28(2) 1-12

Cox, Andrew (2017). Presentation on UN-Habitat financial situation to High Level Panel, 6 May

Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2013) *World Economic and Social Survey 2013: Sustainable Development Challenges*, http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/publications/world-economic-and-social-survey-2013-sustainable-development-challenges.html

DFID (2011). Multilateral Aid Review: Assessment of United Nations Human Settlements Programme

ECOSOC (2016). The UN development system and its operational activities for development: Updating the definitions,

UNEG (2013) Handbook for Conducting Evaluations of Normative Work in the UN System, http://www.unesco.org/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/IOS/temp/UNEGHandbookNormativeWorkENG.pdf

ECOSOC (2017) Repositioning the UN Development System to Deliver on the 2030 Agenda — Ensuring a Better Future for All, https://www.un.org/ecosoc/sites/www.un.org.ecosoc/files/files/en/qcpr/sg-report-on-unds-qcpr-june-2017.pdf

UNDG (2016) ECOSOC Dialogue on the Longer-term Positioning of the UN Development System in the Context of the 2030 Agenda, https://www.un.org/ecosoc/sites/www.un.org.ecosoc/files/files/en/qcpr/ita-findings-and-conclusions-16-jun-2016.pdf.

Farha, Leilani (2011) *Forced Evictions: Global Crisis, Global Solutions*, UN Habitat, Nairobi.

Francesco Bicciato (2013). *Presentation: The Territorial Approach to Sustainable Human Development the ART Initiative*, Turin, September 20, 2013 III CUCS Congress

Global Policy Forum (2005-2017). Assessed Contributions of UN Specialised agencies http://www.daghammarskjold.se/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Financial-Instr-Report-2016-Final-web.pdf;
https://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/133-tables-and-charts/27480-assessed-contributions-to-un-specialised-agencies.html.

IDMC (2014) *Global Overview 2014: People Internally Displaced by Conflict and Violence*, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) and Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) http://www.internal-displacement.org/assets/publications/2014/201405-global-overview-2014-en.pdf

Kimani-Murage, et al (2014) Trends in childhood mortality in Kenya: the urban advantage has seemingly been wiped out, *Heath Place* 29, 95-103; Minnery, Mary et al (2013) Disparities in child mortality trends in two new states of India, *BMC Public Health* 13 (1) 779

Kruse (2013). Governance Options : Governance Review Process, UN-Habitat

McGranahan Gordon, Daniel Schensul, Gayatri Singh (2016) Inclusive urbanization: Can the 2030 Agenda be delivered without it? *Environment and Urbanization* 28 (1) 13-34

Mitlin, D (2008) With and beyond the state — co-production as a route to political influence, power and transformation for grassroots organisations, Environment and Urbanisation 20(2) 339-360

Mitlin, Diana and David Satterthwaite (2013) *Urban Poverty in the Global South: Scale and Nature*, London and New York: Routledge

MOPAN (2017) *United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) Institutional Assessment Report*

Moser C and C McIlwaine (2014) New frontiers in twenty-first century urban conflict and violence, *Environment and Urbanization* 26 (2) 331-344

Muggah, Robert (2014) Deconstructing the fragile city: exploring insecurity, violence and resilience, *Environment and Urbanization* 26 (2) 345-35

Ravallion, Martin, Shaohua Chen and Prem Sangraula (2008) *New Evidence on the Urbanization of Global Poverty*, Background paper for the World Development Report 2008

Revi, A et al (2014) Urban areas, In Climate Change 2014: *Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC*, http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg2/

Satterthwaite, David (2016) Small and intermediate urban centres in sub-Saharan Africa, *Working Paper 6*, International Institute for Environment and Development

Scovronick, Noah, Simon Lloyd and Sari Kovats (2015) Climate and health in informal urban settlements, *Environment and Urbanixation* 27 (2) 657-678

Tacoli, Cecilia, Gordon McGranahan and David Satterthwaite (2015) Urbanization, rural-urban migration and urban poverty, Human Settlements Working Paper, *London, International Institute for Environment and Development*

United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) (2014), *Basic Services for All in an Urbanising World: the Third Global Report on Local Democracy and Decentralization*, Routledge, London

UNDP (2016) *An Integrated Framework to Support Local Governance and Local Development*, http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/local_governance/integrated-framework-to-support-local-governance-and-local-devel/

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2014) *World Urbanisation Prospects: The 2014 Revision, Highlights* (ST/ESA/SER.A/352).

United Nations Evaluation Group (2012). Professional Peer Review of the Evaluation Function of UN-Habitat, https://unhabitat.org/uneg-professional-peer-review-of-the-evaluation-function-of-un-habitat/

UN-Habitat (2011), *ENOF 2008-13. Medium-term strategic and institutional plan 2008–2013: Promoting Sustainable Urbanization at the Country Level.* http://mirror.unhabitat.org/downloads/docs/ENOF_FA.pdf

UN-Habitat (2012), State of The World's Cities 2012/2013

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2013) *Proposed Work Programme and Budget for the Biennium 2014-2015*

UN-Habitat (2015) Proposed Work Programme and Budget for the Biennium 2016-2017: Report of the Executive Director, UN-Habitat Strategic Plan 2014-2019, https://unhabitat.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/01/Executive%20Summary%20UN-Habitat%20Strategic%20Plan%202014-2019.pdf

UN-Habitat (2015) *The Challenge of Local Government Financing in Developing Countries*, Nairobi, UN-Habitat

UN-Habitat (2015) UN-Habitat global activities report 2015 increasing synergy for greater national ownership.

UN-Habitat (2015) Proposed work programme and budget for the biennium 2016–2017 Report of the Executive Director, UN-Habitat Strategic Plan 2014-2019

UN-Habitat (2015) Global Activities Report: Increasing Synergy for Greater National Ownership, https://unhabitat.org/books/un-habitat-global-country-activities-report-2015-increasing-synergy-for-greater-national-ownership/

UN-Habitat (2017) Mid Term Evaluation of the Implementation of UN-Habitat's Strategic Plan, 2014-2019.

Annex XI

Additional documents reviewed by the Panel

Australian Government (2012). Australian Multilateral Assessment of the United Nations Human Settlement Programme (UN-Habitat).

Calthorpe Associates — EMERALD CITIES Planning for Smart and Green China

Dalberg (2017). Consultant's Report: System-wide outline of the functions and capacities of the UN Development System.

DFID — Department for International Development (2011). Multilateral Aid Review: Ensuring maximum value for money for UK aid through multilateral organisations

European Commission — ECHO (2016). Report: Pillar Assessment of the United Nations Human Settlement Programme.

Helgason, Kristin & Mahn, Timo (2014). Governance of United Nations Development: Recharging multilateral cooperation for the post-2015 era. German Development Institute.

International Institute for Sustainable Development — IISD (2015). Report of the Seventh Session of the World Urban Forum (WUF7), 'Urban Equity in Development'- Cities for Life United Nations Settlement Programme/WUF.

Office of Internal Oversight Services — OIOS (2014). Evaluation of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, presented to the General Assembly on December 22.

Office of Internal Oversight Services — OIOS (2015). E/AC.51/2015/2, Evaluation of the United Nations Human Settlement Programme, United Nations Economic and Social Council.

Office of Internal Oversight Services — OIOS (2016). Audit of the United Nations Human Settlement Programme project management process.

Romesh Muttukumaru — Independent Expert (2016). Towards enhancing core (unrestricted) funding to the UN Development system in the post-2015 period. A report prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs for the 2016 Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review, https://www.un.org/ecosoc/sites/www.un.org.ecosoc/files/files/en/qcpr/qcpr-2016-desk-review-core-funding-paper.pdf.

Secretary General's High Level Panel (2017). Combined inputs from relevant stakeholder groups to High Level Panel questions to assess and enhance the effectiveness of UN-Habitat

Secretary General's High Level Panel (2017). Combined Member States responses to High Level Panel questions to assess and enhance the effectiveness of UN-Habitat.

Secretary General's High-Level Panel (2017). Notes: Second meeting of the Secretary General's High Level Panel to Assess and Enhance Effectiveness of UN-Habitat.

Secretary-Generals' High Level Panel (2017). Combined paper: The New Urban Agenda and the way Forward for UN-Habitat

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS: monitoring human settlements indicators. A short guide to human settlements indicators goal 11+

The German Development Institute (2014). Governance of United Nations Development: Recharging multilateral cooperation for the post-2015 era

The Partnering Initiative (2014). PLATFORMS FOR PARTNERSHIP: Emerging good practice to systematically engage business as a partner in development

UN Economic and Social Council — ECOSOC (2015). Evaluation of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme. Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services.

UN Economic and Social Council-ECOSOC (2015). Dialogue on the longer-term positioning of the UN development system in the context of the post-2015 development agenda. Background Note, Workshop 3 — Governance

UN Environment — Handbook for stakeholder Engagement.

UN Environment (2015). PowerPoint Presentation on "Introduction to the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP".

UN General Assembly Joint Inspection Unit (2017). Contribution: PARA 45 of UNGA Resolution 71/243 (QCPR).

UN Women Governance, http://www.unwomen.org/en/about-us/governance

UN Women, UN System Coordination: http://www.unwomen.org/en/how-we-work/un-system-coordination

UN-Habitat — A guide to setting up an Urban Observatory.

UN-Habitat — Global Urban Observatory (GUO).

UN-Habitat — Global Urban Observatory, UrbanInfo User Guide Reference.

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2009). HSP/GC/22/2/Add.2 Addendum: Progress report on the implementation of the medium-term strategic and institutional plan for the United Nations Human Settlements Programme for the period 2008–2013

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2009). HSP/GC/22/2/Add.3 Addendum: Efficiency and effectiveness of the governance structure of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme: Note by the Executive Director

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2011). Background document of the 23rd Governing Council. Overview of the Evolution of Governance and Reporting Structures of UN-Habitat

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2011). HSP/GC/23/INF/7 Review of the governance structure of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, phase III. Note by the Secretariat

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2013). HSP/GC/24/2/Add.1 Review of the governance structure of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme: Report of the Executive Director.

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2013). HSP/GC/24/5/Add.1 Progress report on the implementation of the medium-term strategic and institutional plan (2008-2013). Report of the Executive Director

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2013). HSP/GC/24/INF/6 UN-Habitat Governance Options, background document for the 24th Governing Council. Note by the Secretariat

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2015). Activities of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, including coordination matters. Report of the Executive Director.

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2015). HSP/GC/25/2/Add.1 Review of the Governance Structure of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme. Report of the Executive Director

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2015). HSP/GC/25/INF/2, Activities of the United Nations Human Settlement Programme.

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2015). HSP/GC/25/L.7 Draft resolution 25/ [ ]: United Nations Human Settlements Programme governance reform. Submission by the co-facilitators.

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2017). Addendum: Activities of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, Working Group on programme and budget — Report of the Executive Director

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2017). Addendum: Activities of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, Working group on programme and budget, Report of the Executive Director.

UN-Habitat — Governing Council (2017). Work of the Committee of Permanent Representatives during the intersessional period. Note by the secretariat.

UN-Habitat — Working Group on Programme and Budget (2015). Report of the Working Group on Programme of Work and Budget.

UN-Habitat (1976). The Vancouver Declaration on Human Settlements.

UN-Habitat (2003) The Habitat Agenda Goals and Principles, Commitments and the Global Plan of Action,

UN-Habitat (2006). Istanbul Declaration on Human Settlements.

UN-Habitat (2009). Global Urban Indicators — Selected Statistics. Monitoring the Habitat agenda and the Millennium Development Goals.

UN-Habitat (2009). HSP/GC/22/2/Add.3, Activities of the United Nations Human Settlement Programme: Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Governance Structures. Note by the Executive Director.

UN-Habitat (2009). Urban Indicators Guidelines: "Better information, Better Cities" — Monitoring the Habitat Agenda and the Millennium Development Goals-Slums Target.

UN-Habitat (2011). HSP/GC/23/2/Add.1, Review of the governance structure of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme. Report of the Executive Director.

UN-Habitat (2011). Overview of the Evolution of Governance and Reporting Structure of UN-Habitat.

UN-Habitat (2012). Evaluation of the Implementation of UN-Habitat's Mid-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan 2008-2013.

UN-Habitat (2012). Management Response: Evaluation of the Implementation of UN-Habitat's Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan 2008-2013

UN-Habitat (2012). UN-Habitat Evaluation Brief: Evaluation of the Implementation of the Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (2008-2013).

UN-Habitat (2013). HSP/GC/24/2/Add.1, Activities of the United Nations Human Settlement Programme: Review of the Governance Structure, Report of the Executive Director.

UN-Habitat (2013). Report of the Take-Off Conference: Strengthening Partnerships for a Africa Urban Agenda.

UN-Habitat (2013). State of the World's Cities 2012/2013. Prosperity of Cities.

UN-Habitat (2014). HSP/WUF/7/3, Report of Seventh Session of the World Forum: urban Equity in Development — Cities for Life.

UN-Habitat (2014). State of African Cities 2014: Re-imaging Sustainable Urban Transition.

UN-Habitat (2015) Urban Equity in Development: Cities for life — Concept paper,

UN-Habitat (2015). HSP/GC/25/2/Add.1, Review of the Governance Structure of United Nations Human Settlement Programme. Report of the Executive Director.

UN-Habitat (2016). 21 Projects Compendium: Implementing the New Urban Agenda. UN-Habitat (2016). Annual Progress Report: Demonstrating Results of the Strategic Plan 2014-2019.

UN-Habitat (2016). Bi-Annual Programme Activity Report: Consolidating our Impacts.

UN-Habitat (2016). Evaluation of the Open UN-Habitat Transparent Initiative. United Nations Human Settlement Programme.

UN-Habitat (2016). Quarterly Financial Status Report to 63rd CPR Meeting — December.

UN-Habitat (2016). Revenue Distribution by Fund for the year ended December 2016.

UN-Habitat (2016). Sustainable Cities and Communities: SDG Goal 11 Monitoring Framework: A guide to assist national and local governments to monitor and report on SDG goal 11 indicators.

UN-Habitat (2016). The City Prosperity Initiative. A tool to measures Sustainable Urban Development

UN-Habitat (2016). World Cities Report, Urbanisation and Development — Emerging Futures.

UN-Habitat (2017). Action Framework for Implementation of the New Urban Agenda.

UN-Habitat (2017). Africa Region: Country project Portfolios. Strategic Planning Period 2014-2017.

UN-Habitat (2017). Financial Overview, 2017. United Nations Human Settlement Programme, presented to the panel.

UN-Habitat (2017). Fund Fact Sheet: Implementation Facility for Sustainable Urban Development (IFSUD).

UN-Habitat (2017). Global Activities Report

UN-Habitat (2017). Global Projects: Country Project Portfolios. Strategic Planning Period 2014-2017.

UN-Habitat (2017). HSP/GC/26/7 Report of the 26th Session Governing Council of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

UN-Habitat (2017). List of ongoing projects.

UN-Habitat (2017). Proposed Work Programme and Budget for the Biennium 2018-2019. Report of the Executive Director,

UN-Habitat (2017). Quarterly report on the financial status of UN-Habitat to 64th CPR Meeting — March.

UN-Habitat (2017). Quarterly report on the financial status of UN-Habitat to 65th CPR Meeting — June.

UN-Habitat (2017). Service Legal Agreement.

UN-Habitat (2017). UN-Habitat Today.

UN-Habitat (2017). Updated Communication Strategy. Communicate and Engage, for a better Urban future: Communication as a Tool for Promoting Sustainable Urban Development.

UN-Habitat Steering National Urban Policies.

UN-Habitat-Governing Council (2011). HSP/GC/23/2/Add.1 Review of the governance structure of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme. Report of the Executive Director

UN-Habitat-Governing Council (2015). HSP/GC/25/2/Add.5, Cooperation with agencies and organisations within the United Nations system, intergovernmental organisations outside the United Nations system, non-governmental organisations and other Habitat Agenda partners. Report of the Executive Director.

United Nations — Habitat II (2003). The Habitat Agenda Goals and Principles, Commitments and the Global Plan of Action.

United Nations — Habitat III (2017.) The New Urban Agenda.

United Nations (2015). Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the third International Conference on Financing for Development

United Nations (2015). Supplement to the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations. Secretary-General's bulletin.

United nations (2015). UN System Chart.

United Nations (2017). UN Global Staff Satisfactory Survey.

United Nations Environment Programme — Governing Council proceedings of 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 & 2013.

United Nations General Assembly (1977). Proposed program budget for the biennium 1978-1979. United Nations Environment Programme: Administrative arrangements regarding the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation. Note by the Secretary-General.

United Nations General Assembly (2017). A/RES/71/235, Implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III) and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN Habitat). Resolution adopted by the General Assembly.

United Nations General Assembly (2017). A/RES/71/256* Resolution adopted on 23 December 2016: 71/256. New Urban Agenda

United Nations General Assembly 26th Session — establishment of the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation.

United Nations Population Fund — UNFPA (2007). Review of the organisational structure of the United Nations Population Fund.

United Nations System — Chief Executive Board for Coordination (2016) "Urbanisation and Sustainable Development: A United Nations System Input to a New Urban Agenda"

World Health Organisation — WHO. Rules of procedure of the World Health Assembly (WHA).

Zeiderman, A.; Kaker, S.; Silver, J.; Wood, A. and Ramakrishnan, K. (2017). Urban Uncertainty: Governing cities in turbulent times. London School of Economics: LSE Cities.